

JPRS 82872

16 February 1983

# East Europe Report

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 2107

**FBIS**

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

16 February 1983

EAST EUROPE REPORT  
POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 2107

## CONTENTS

## GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

- Christian Democratic Union's Growing Influence Analyzed  
(Gisela Schuetze; DEUTSCHLAND ARCHIV, Dec 82)..... 1
- Military Prosecutor Vows Strict Punishment of Border  
Violators  
(Alfred Leibner Interview; VOLKSARMEE, No 40, 1982)..... 7
- 'Developed Socialism' Phase Allows Positive View of Luther  
(SONNTAG, 28 Nov, 31 Oct 82)..... 13
- Luther, Marxian 'Freedom' Congruities, by Kurt Nowak  
Luther-Muentzer 'Dialectical Unity', by Adolf Laube

## HUNGARY

- Trade Union Leaders Mobilize Members To Back Tough Govern-  
ment Program  
(Gyula Virizlay; NEPSZAVA, 24 Dec 82)..... 23

## POLAND

- Philosopher Views Solidarity as Anti-Soviet Revolution  
(Leszek Kolakowski; LE MATIN, 13 Dec 82)..... 29

## ROMANIA

- Status of Minorities in Romanian State of 1918  
(Mircea Musat, Florian Tanasescu; ANALE DE ISTORIE,  
Sep-Oct 82)..... 32

## YUGOSLAVIA

- Briefs  
Sentenced for Hostile Acts 50

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRATIC UNIONS'S GROWING INFLUENCE ANALYZED

Cologne DEUTSCHLAND ARCHIV in German Vol 15 No 12, Dec 82 (signed to press 22 Nov 82) pp 1248-1251

['Commentaries and Topical Discussions' feature article by Gisela Schuetze, editor, East-West editorial office, Deutschlandfunk, Cologne: "The New Self-Awareness Is Not Sufficient: The GDR's CDU at its 15th Party Congress in Dresden (13-15 October 1982)"]

[Text] The GDR's CDU struck a distinctly self-confident posture at its 15th Party Congress in Dresden on 13-15 October 1982. And it had some reason to do so. First of all, it continues to be the largest and most important of the four block parties of the SED, the only one with any claims to being a people's party, one with an almost programmatic adherence to another philosophy than the dominant one of Marxist-Leninism and the party with the largest participation in government relative to its size. With a present membership of exactly 125,103 members, it has not only grown by some 10,000 members since its last party congress 5 years ago, but in doing so, it has also taken a decisive step toward a long overdue rejuvenation.

Secondly, the CDU is needed by the SED now more than ever before, not only as are the other block parties in the country's economic struggle, but also against certain separate pacifistic currents within the area of activity allowed to the churches and against the demands, particularly from young Christians, for a social service alternative to compulsory military service. It has used this to regain its share in the dialog with the churches which it appeared to have been losing ever since Erich Honecker's direct contacts with the church hierarchy in March 1978. Even though it declines to play the role of a mediator whenever difficulties arise, it can still point with pride at its party congress not only to its growing influence with non-party-affiliated Christians but also to the heightened interest of ecclesiastical circles in the work of the CDU, to its providing "food for thought" for the churches (Goetting), to the awakening of new theological "insights into the substance and the assurance of political responsibility on the part of Christians" (Heyl). Not least of all, current peace propaganda has also served to strengthen its foreign connections. CDU head Gerald Goetting announced an expansion of contacts which have been growing over recent years in number and intensity, with Christian Democratic parties in non-socialist countries.<sup>3</sup> Thirdly, the CDU will receive a fresh impetus and new historical credentials through the celebration of a double jubilee in the coming year. The joint state and church ceremonies commemorating the 500th birthday of Martin Luther could serve to document the impact of Christian tradition within the socialist image of the world and history.<sup>4</sup> The 100th birthday of Otto Nuschke, the cofounder, "father and teacher" of the party, also



provided an occasion to underscore the purported continuity of the party's evolution, although tracing it back to the proclamation of the party's founding in 1945 seemed somewhat forced since it gave equal assertion to peace service and to the power which flows from the working class into the entire populace, in addition to being at odds with its emphasis at the same time of an historical path and unparalleled political and intellectual achievements in Germany's past and present, and with that the creation of a new tradition of Christian and socialist cooperation, based upon Nuschke's affirmation of the development of socialism almost exactly 30 years ago.<sup>5</sup> The CDU was then established as "a party of Christian Democrats of predominantly middle-class and lower middle-class background, who were determined to participate in the anti-fascist/democratic restructuring in an anti-imperialistic sense." The foundation stone was laid in 1952 "for a lower middle-class democratic party which evolved finally into a party which, in alliance with all other social forces, led by the party of the working class, has emblazoned socialism on its banners." And, "as a result of all these processes," it represents a party of Christian citizens who are pledged, by word and deed, to freedom, democracy and socialism." Starting from this position, it then gives evidence of "its share in translating into reality the resolutions of the 10th SED Party Congress aimed at the development of our society."<sup>6</sup> The definition of the party congress declaration accepted 5 years ago and the still valid preamble of its charter, underscore to a certain point its integral continuous development even before the new resolutions of the SED, an accomplishment which--in contrast to the other block parties--has been thoroughgoing, and one which was no doubt made easier by the greater distancing of the CDU Congress from the SED's Party Congress.

Not to be overlooked was, fourthly, a significantly greater courage of Christian conviction. This has certainly been promoted by the peace propaganda campaign. The invocation, for example, of a Christian work ethic was transparent enough. On the other hand, the "C" in the party's name is really probably more than a mere label. The Christian conviction of many of the discussion speakers was genuine, in any case. And Goetting, for example, advocated, parallel to the indispensable transmission of knowledge of Marxist-Leninism, the transmission of a basic knowledge of Biblical fundamentals, regardless of the philosophical convictions of the individual. Adolf Niggemeier, member of the Presidium of the CDU Executive Council and its secretary of agitation, admitted in a private conversation, certainly not by chance, that people had earlier been too inhibited in the formulation of what was genuinely Christian--out of concern that such language would be perceived by some as simply camouflage and simply not understood by still others.

At the same time, all four points together do not suffice to make the party's independence or even its growing responsibility within a coalition plausible, although this autonomy was underscored not just by CDU officials but also by SED guest participant Paul Verner. In contrast to this could be seen the nearly total mimicry of the SED Party Congress, including the obligatory processional march of an honor guard from the National People's Army: marking the party congress not as a genuine discussion forum, but one limited to declamation and acclamation with over 50 previously prepared speeches and shorter contributions. The old problem of the unity of alliance partnership and autonomy was seen as the third point of emphasis of the CDU Congress, following the peace question and collaboration in strengthening the country's economic

potential. It was particularly with respect to economic and peace policy that the CDU's dependence upon the SED was best documented.

With regard to economics, the party accepted part and parcel the ambitious 10-point program of the SED as its own, in the same way as it continues to see its task as the winning over of party members, non-party-affiliated middle-class Christians, persons engaged in construction, transport and health professions, farmers, independent craftsmen and small business proprietors, together with their old hard-core membership of teachers, artists and "progressive" theologians to the current SED line. Some 95 percent of the party's members promptly enrolled in the socialist competition for fulfillment and overfulfillment of current planning goals. An increasing number of non-party-affiliated Christians were recruited for participation in the National Front. More than 5,800 suggestions and proposals dealing with various social problems were submitted to local government bodies, with 414 of them going on to central state institutions.<sup>8</sup> Yet whatever opinion one might hold, say of the merits of local government reorganization as a new party task, there are really no political laurels to be won in that effort. Both the LDPD and the NDPD can point to proposals that have been enacted in the area of policy governing small handicrafts enterprises. The closest the CDU has come to autonomy has been with its numerous proposals for "further improvement in the clinical and social welfare of its citizens, particularly their outpatient care . . . of further expanding the maintenance, care and rehabilitation of handicapped citizens." There were also the first signs of a cautious self-profiling as an environmental issue party. The CDU has a keen instinct for what might be called "decontrolled" social and cultural alternatives. In earlier years it was already playing a kind of vanguard role for the GDR's turning of its attention to the whole of its "cultural heritage."

On the question of peace policy the party avoided any hint of polemics directed at the churches. The only demand made was one that the churches concentrate their peace commitment more strongly on seeking unity with other forces in society. Gerald Goetting, in his party congress address, was able to put forward unconditionally the well-known SED equation of peace and socialism as well as the clear distinction between the friends of peace and its foes, following the old CDU motto: "ex oriente pax." In contrast to the churches, he explicitly assailed the equation of armaments in the East and the West, speaking against any "unilateral disarmament of socialism" and against the "powerlessness and weaponlessness of the peacelovers,"<sup>11</sup> probably not by accident in the formulation of Kurt Hager, which had once attracted considerable attention, of a million-fold alliance of Christians, Marxists and pacifists, but substituting the phrase "other humanist forces."<sup>12</sup> The declaration of the 15th Party Congress, "With all our might for the protection of peace, for the preservation of life" --the single most important congress resolution apart from Goetting's speech--made it appropriately clear, "Christian striving for peace will take on reality to the degree that it makes a clear choice of sides. Supposedly neutral positions will always prove themselves futile . . . For as long as socialism is threatened militarily, its peace policy and its defensive readiness are of a piece, and it follows that military service within socialism is a legitimate form of peace service."<sup>13</sup>

This includes sympathy for the soldiers of the unarmed construction battalions, but not for an alternative social service.<sup>14</sup> There was as little direct mention of this issue as there was of the mottos "Schwerter zu Pflugscharen" (Swords into Ploughshares) and "Frieden Schaffen Ohne Waffen" (Create Peace

Without Arms) or the actions taken against young men who have refused to perform their reserve duties under arms. With all seriousness Goetting praised the harmony between socialist school education and the interests of Christian parents, as if no discrimination or no criticism of the paramilitary training supported by even the CDU or the education to hatred which is simply denied by the party. One pastor's daughter enrolled in teacher training was told to make a model refutation of the charge expressed by a number of Christian parents that "the failure of their child to be admitted to higher education could be traced to their having been professing Christians."<sup>15</sup> For the rest, the frictions in the relationship between church and state were so studiously pushed out of sight with a few, at best vague, hints of isolated situations of societal experiment, that even the invited ecclesiastical representatives would only sing the canticle of the unity of civil and Christian duties.

Mention has already been made of the intensification of foreign political activities in the wake of the peace propaganda undertaken by the SED. Goetting's appeal to all Christian Democrat parties of Western Europe for a policy of peace and renunciation of NATO's arms buildup were without doubt aimed in particular at the CDU/CSU. The CDU elected to give precedence to Politburo member Verner in making a response to the inaugural address of Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl. Verner spoke openly of the debasement of pledges to continuity and consistency evidenced by the new chancellor's declaring the alliance with the United States as a basic principle of his country's policy, of seeking to implement the NATO arms buildup resolution and of striking a nationalistic tone in relationships with the GDR that were reminiscent of the Cold War. The more loaded passages, however, were hushed over in the media after the more moderate ADN interview with Erich Honecker. A more moderate tone was also struck by Adolf Niggemeier who, when asked about possible objections to contacts with the CDU/CSU and his assessment of the inaugural address, said in an interview with the Deutschlandfunk:

"I have no objections. Yet it appears in practice that things which fortunately have become a thing of the past in governmental relationships between the Federal Republic of Germany and the GDR, namely the claim to sole representation, apparently still continue to exist in the relationship of the CDU in the Federal Republic to the Christian Democratic Union here in our country. We bear the same name and we have the same founders. Keeping in mind why we came forward in 1945 and what our goals were then: peace, the establishment of an antiimperialistic, antimilitaristic society, a society of the new democracy . . . there might also be an opportunity for contacts . . . which would have a medium-range future . . . I did not have the opportunity to read the text (Kohl's inaugural address), only the extensive coverage given in our newspapers, and also the ADN interview. I am somewhat concerned that many things that have come to pass over the long years and through great hardships, could simply be thrown overboard. I don't want to get my own hopes up too high. Still, I really like to keep the hope and to wish that this basic affirmation which seems to have determined the relationship of both sides in recent years, namely that a war will never again emanate from German soil, that this does not become forgotten, but that people will act with this basic principle in mind, especially so in the Federal Republic."

Concerning the party itself, its age and social structures, the party congress unfortunately supplied little information. These are the most interesting data:

the number of local party organization units is in the range of 5,750. More than 20,000 party members, according to Goetting, are engaged as full-time government officials and as parliamentary deputies, successor candidates or as citizen members of the permanent commissions of local governments. One press release indicated the more exact total of some 22,700 Christian Democrats within the framework of the people's representation. Goetting himself spoke of some 900 party members "who are active as full-time members of county and local government councils, as mayors and members of city councils." In 366 cities and communities the CDU installed mayors and the office of the lord mayor of Weimar, traditionally held by the CDU, was once again occupied by a member of that party after the congress. Well over 43,000 party members are active in the various bodies of the National Front. More than 1,700 CDU members are directors or deputy directors of socialist enterprises in industry and agriculture. More than 26,500 members hold an honorary office in the party.

Data concerning office holders at the party congress can only be extrapolated to party members at large with caution. It is not simply that those members in the state and party apparatus are predictably overrepresented here. Also overrepresented at the 15th Party Congress of the CDU were pastors and theologians. The 45 party congress delegates, out of a total of some 10,000 official and especially honorary church representatives, are in contrast to a mere few hundred in the entire party. CDU head Gerald Goetting, as was expected, was reconfirmed in his office at the party congress. The elections to the senior party leadership posts brought with it a slight weeding out. The presidium of the executive council was cut from 25 to 19 members, the secretariat from 21 to 19 members. Apart from this, the emphasis seemed to be on continuity in personnel policy. The election of East Berlin district leader Dietrich Voigtberger to the executive council presidium brought forth the single new face to be seen.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. For data, s. article by Gisela Helwig, DEUTSCHLAND ARCHIV Vol 11, 1977 p 1124. Gerald Goetting, succeeded in 1976 as president of the GDR Parliament, was appointed vice president of this body in 1980.
2. Gerald Goetting, "Bericht des Hauptvorstandes an den 15. Parteitag der CDU (Parteitagsmaterial)" (Report of the Executive Committee to the 15th Party Congress of the CDU [Party Congress Material]) pp 5, 7.
3. Ibid., p 30. Concerning similar foreign foreign policy activity of the LDPD, cf. article by Karl Wilhelm Fricke, DEUTSCHLAND ARCHIV Vol 5, 1982 p 465.
4. Cf., i.a., Goetting, op. cit., p 67.
5. Cf., i.a., the press release "Die CDU in der DDR (Parteitagsmaterial)" (The CDU in the GDR [Party Congress Material]), p 2.
6. Goetting, op. cit., note 2, p 7f.
7. Ibid., p 52.
8. Wolfgang Heyl, broadcast on Radio DDR I, "Kommentar des Tages," 12 October 1982 and Goetting, op. cit., p 62 f.



9. Goetting, op. cit., p 60.
10. Cf. esp. the essay by Doris Behrend, "Bulletin Erster Beratungstag (Parteitagsmaterial)" (Bulletin of the First Day of Deliberations [Party Congress Material]), pp 46 ff.
11. Ibid., pp 18, 23, 25.
12. S.a., "Erklaerung des 15. Parteitags, Vorlage Nr. 2 (Parteitagsmaterial)" (Declaration of the 15th Party Congress, Motion No 2 [Party Congress Material]), p 7.
13. Ibid.
14. According to a statement by Adolf Niggemeier in an interview with the Deutschlandfunk in THEMEN DER ZEIT of 18 October 1982.
15. "Bulletin, Zweiter Beratungstag (Parteitagsmaterial)" p 37.
16. Cf. article by Ilse Spittmann, "Wechsel und Kontinuitaet" (Change and Continuity), in DEUTSCHLAND ARCHIV, Vol 11, 1982 pp1121 ff.
17. Ibid., note 14.
18. Cf. the press release "Die CDU in der DDR," pp 4,7 and Goetting, op. cit., pp 62, 75 ff. Concerning the mayoral election in Weimar, s. ADN wire service report of 21 October 1982: Franz Kirchner (CDU) was succeeded by Gerhard Baumgaertl (CDU) for health reasons.

9878

CSO: 2300/116

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

MILITARY PROSECUTOR VOWS STRICT PUNISHMENT OF BORDER VIOLATORS

East Berlin VOLKSARMEE in German No 40, 1982 (signed to press 27 Sep 82) pp 3-4

[VA interview with Lt Gen Alfred Leibner, GDR deputy prosecutor general and military chief prosecutor (date and place of interview not given): "In the Interest of the Security of the GDR and the Protection of Its Border Troops: Appropriate Reaction to Any Violation of the Law--Consistent Punishment for Any Assault on the GDR State Border and the Members of the GDR Border Troops"]

[Text] [Question] Comrade Lieutenant General! In July of this year the fugitive criminal Hoehne was sentenced by the Leipzig superior military court to life imprisonment for the murder of a member of the GDR border troops. The GDR Supreme Court upheld this decision in an appeal hearing. Why were these criminal proceedings carried out in our courts, even though the offender is residing in the FRG?

[Answer] From 19 to 23 July 1982 the trial involving the fugitive murderer Hoehne was held in the Leipzig superior military court. As is known, on 1 August 1981 Hoehne had shot Ensign (Faehrich) Klaus-Peter Braun of the border troops while he was on duty. After doing this the murderer fled into the FRG.

Preliminary proceedings were instituted against the fugitive criminal, and a warrant was issued for his arrest. Since then, the GDR prosecutor general has repeatedly requested the competent legal authorities of the FRG to apprehend and extradite the fugitive offender.

Up to this day, the legal authorities of the FRG have not complied with this request, although an extensive body of evidence was turned over to them.

Here also the FRG legal authorities are doing everything they can to protect such criminals, as they have done again and again in the past.

Since the crime committed by Hoehne was directed against the life of a GDR citizen, since the crime was committed in the national territory of the GDR, and since the offender himself is a GDR citizen, the deed unquestionably falls within the purview of the penal laws of the GDR.

In order to prevent this murderer from escaping his just punishment, I brought charges against him before the Leipzig superior military court on the basis of the GDR's penal laws, and I called for the proper punishment of Hoehne.

The SED Tenth Party Congress has set for us the task of "protecting the socialist order and the peaceful life of the citizens of the GDR and of all the states of the socialist community against any attacks by the aggressive forces of imperialism and reaction, and ensuring the sovereignty of the GDR, its territorial integrity, the inviolability of its borders, and its national security."

With the criminal proceedings against Hoehne, we are thus acting in conformity with the principle of our socialist justice, that an appropriate reaction is to be given to every violation of the law.

The trial before the Leipzig superior military court has made it clear that a criminal cannot escape his accountability even by fleeing to the FRG. Hoehne was found guilty as a result of the evidence taken on the murder. With the conviction of the murderer Hoehne, the following was unmistakably demonstrated as the position of the GDR:

1. The penal laws of the GDR are applicable to all criminal acts which are committed within its national territory. The jurisdiction of the GDR is indivisible.
2. No criminal who illegally leaves the GDR following a crime can escape from a criminal prosecution by the GDR's organs of justice having the competent authority for his case.

When there is a sentencing in absentia, the GDR also firmly insists on the extradition of the offender.

[Question] Comrade Lieutenant General! You have mentioned the aiding and abetting of murderers of members of the GDR border troops by legal authorities in the FRG. Can you expound on this for us in somewhat more detail?

[Answer] The minister for national defense, Army General Hoffmann, made the following remarks on the occasion of the 35th anniversary of the GDR border troops: "So long as politicians and governmental representatives of the Federal Government and Laender in the FRG proclaim in all seriousness that the state border between the GDR and the FRG is really no border at all according to their understanding, so long as in that very state there are judges who render decisions and teachers who use textbooks in which the borders referred to are those of the German Reich as of the year 1937, for just so long will we see every reason for exercising the utmost vigilance along our border with that state."

Faithful to their oath of allegiance, the members of the GDR border troops are fulfilling their civic duty, in the awareness that they are making an effective contribution toward the strengthening of socialism and the maintenance of peace along the dividing line between socialism and imperialism in Europe. It is due to them as well that because of their reliable protection of our state border, the citizens of our country are able to live in peace and security.

The enemy is inveighing against this fact with all the means available to it, especially with the cunning ideological manipulating and smear campaign propagated by its mass media. We know too well the massive efforts of certain circles in the FRG to defame our border-security measures and our border troops, with the aim of stirring up provocations and assaults on the state border and of inciting criminal elements to openly carry out hostile and felonious attacks against members of the border troops. In the year 1981 alone, there were over 7080 cases where the sovereign territory of the GDR was violated from the direction of the FRG and Berlin (West). The murder attempts on members of the border troops of the GDR and the friendly attitude which the FRG has taken toward the murderers remain in our memories.

The murderers of Captain Rudi Arnstadt, Corporal Peter Goering, and Corporal Reinhold Huhn, to mention only a few, are living scot-free and at large even today in the FRG, where they can let themselves be lionized as "heroes" in certain circles there.

We do not forget with how much judicial benevolence, unconcealed sympathy, and completely unjustifiable leniency the double murderer Weinhold was received in the FRG. This behavior met with international disapproval and aroused justified indignation. In order to save their reputation, judges of the jury court at Hagen felt compelled to convict Weinhold. Notwithstanding the leniency with which they treated Weinhold, they had to recognize the fact that the extensive body of evidence in support of extradition which was turned over to them by the GDR prosecutor general had a great deal of evidential value and could not be refuted.

Obviously, in the case of the murderer Hoehne the legal authorities in the FRG are pursuing the same goal.

They are ignoring the evidence turned over to them and are declaring from the very start that it is not sufficient to support the line of argumentation with respect to the presence of a strong suspicion of voluntary manslaughter. But that is not in line with the facts. If still another proof is needed of the friendly attitude toward murderers in the FRG, I can draw attention to the murdering of Eberhard Knospe, a corporal in the border troops.

The extradition of the fugitive Decker requested by the GDR prosecutor general was refused by legal authorities in the FRG. Such behavior is at variance with internationally recognized and practiced conventions.

In the past, the GDR has always complied with requests by the FRG for the arrest and extradition of criminals who had committed crimes within the territory of the FRG. Thus, among other people a sergeant 1st class in the Federal Armed Forces against whom preliminary proceedings were pending in the FRG because of voluntary manslaughter was arrested in the territory of the GDR and was extradited to the FRG.

The violating of the principle of reciprocity by FRG organs is at variance with the basic treaty and with current rules of international law.



[Question] Comrade Lieutenant General! What do you see as the reasons for such an attitude?

[Answer] Here we must mention first of all the decision by the FRG Federal Constitutional Court on the basic treaty. This decision refuses to recognize the state border of the GDR as binding under international law. Up to now the FRG has not been prepared to respect the national status of the GDR. The activity of the so-called "Central Registration Office" at Salzgitter also represents an interfering in the domestic affairs of the GDR; by way of this office, GDR citizens--even members of the GDR border troops--are to be placed on record and subject to criminal prosecution by the FRG judiciary because of their governmental or social activity.

The activity of this office, which is contrary to international law, has as its essence the complete denial of the sovereignty of the GDR, especially its legislative, judicial, and personal sovereignty. The Central Registration Office openly calls upon GDR citizens to disregard the legal system of their state, it exhorts them to be untrue to their civic loyalty, and it threatens GDR citizens with criminal prosecution.

With that, it is serving also those revanchist forces in the FRG which are taking advantage of the acts of intervention by the Central Registration Office--although these are contrary to international law--to prepare acts of aggression, with such forces being engaged also in an unbridled smear campaign and vilification against the GDR for this purpose. The attitude of the FRG legal authorities shows itself to be a component of the policy of interference in the domestic affairs of the GDR.

Advocates of this policy in the FRG--among whom we must also include public prosecutors and judges who are empowered to make decisions here--have obviously taken pleasure in getting the utmost mileage out of the FRG's "claim to sole representation," even though it has been clear at the very latest since the treaty of 21 December 1972 on the fundamentals of relations between the GDR and FRG that the jurisdiction of each of the two states is to be restricted to its own national territory and the independence and autonomy of each of the two states in domestic and foreign affairs is to be respected. Evidently this treaty provision, which is binding under international law, has not yet found acceptance in the office rooms of FRG legal authorities.

We know from history that among other ways the symbolic figure of justice is represented with a blindfold. This symbolic figure is significant. In this case, it stands with eyes shut in front of a murderer. Here, even the evidence which was turned over is ignored, and commitments which were given are not adhered to. Such practice is at variance with the basic treaty and also contravenes the Helsinki Final Act. Obviously the FRG legal authorities are determined to let Hoehne get off scot-free.

[Question] Trials against fugitive murderers represent an exception. Is it possible to have an unequivocal determination of the guilt of an offender in such proceedings?

[Answer] It is correct to say that trials against fugitive murderers represent an exception. This type of proceedings is not employed in every case where an offender is a fugitive. The legal prerequisites for holding such a trial are laid down in the GDR code of criminal procedure. Generally it should be noted that the trial takes place only upon an appropriate petition by the public prosecutor, and that a defense attorney is to be assigned for the fugitive. From this fact alone it already follows that the right to a defense is safeguarded. Also included among the prerequisites which must be present before the conducting of a trial against a fugitive is possible is the requirement that the preliminary proceedings have clarified the facts of the case to the point where no doubt exists as to the possibility of being able to unequivocally establish the guilt of the defendant.

The presentation of the case in the criminal proceedings against the murderer Hoehne was based on a high level of expertise and impartiality. All the participants in the publicly conducted trial were able to see for themselves that this was so.

Close attention was devoted to the careful clarification of the course of events and the determination of all the circumstances relating to the criminal accountability of the offender.

In the trial before the Leipzig superior military court and in the appeal hearing before the GDR Supreme Court, the presentation of the case rested on the following:

- Testimonies concerning the situation and identity of the offender
- evidential documents on his identity
- points of evidence and clues concerning the deed
- evidential documents in the form of a presentation of the record of the crime-scene investigation and the autopsy report
- a number of criminological and forensic-medicine reports and the explanations made about them by the experts.

In this way it was possible to prove unequivocally that the offender fired three separate shots at his victim with the intention to kill him.

However much the account is being circulated in articles of the FRG press that the shots had gone off unintentionally, this is clearly refuted by the upshot of the evidence taken.

[Question] What effect do you think will be produced by the criminal proceedings against the fugitive Hoehne?

[Answer] The decision issued against Hoehne is based on unequivocal evidence. The people in the FRG must now come to terms with the fact that a murderer who was legally convicted by a regular court of law is living at large among the FRG population. With this conviction of the murderer, the GDR's right of

extradition has been confirmed. The GDR has concluded law-enforcement treaties with many other states. From that fact alone it follows that there are a number of practical possibilities for apprehending the offender. With the conviction of Hoehne, it was made clear that such crimes do not continue to go unpunished. In general, it can be stated that in all these murder proceedings the GDR's right to criminal prosecution is not surrendered. This situation is not altered even when there is a conviction in the FRG. In this connection, let me call to mind the case of Jablonski. Jablonski had murdered Corporal Weiss, a member of the GDR border troops on duty, and he was sentenced to 9 years of imprisonment in the FRG, of which he served 6 years. Later he was arrested by security agents of the GDR and was sentenced to life imprisonment by the Berlin superior military court.

The double murderer Weinhold as well as the fugitive Klaus Decker, who on 5 May 1982 intentionally killed Corporal Eberhard Knospe of the GDR border troops, will not escape their just punishment either. Every assault on the GDR state border and on the members of the border troops is prosecuted with utmost determination in the interest of the security of our state and the protection of our border soldiers, and if necessary it is punished by penal means, as in the case of Hoehne.

[Question] Comrade Lieutenant General, we thank you for this interview!

12114

CSO: 2300/117

'DEVELOPED SOCIALISM' PHASE ALLOWS POSITIVE VIEW OF LUTHER

Luther, Marxian 'Freedom' Congruities

East Berlin SONNTAG in German Vol 36 No 48, 28 Nov 82 p 8

[Excerpts from a paper presented at a recent GDR Cultural League conference on Luther at Martin Luther University, Halle, by Dr Kurt Nowak, theologian and church historian, Karl Marx University, Leipzig: "Perspectives of Luther's Image of Man." A translation of the article by Prof Laube follows these excerpts.]

[Text] Luther--greatness, limitation, effect: these were the words displayed in the auditorium of the Martin Luther University for all those who had accepted the invitation of Prof Hans Pischner, president of the Cultural League, to participate in a conference on "Martin Luther in History and the Present" held in the city of the Saale River.

In his welcoming address Hans Pischner reminded the more than 400 guests and interested listeners--philosophers, German scholars, historians, art historians, theologians, experts in local history, monument custodians, bezirk and county propaganda experts working for the Cultural League--that ever since its founding the Cultural League has upheld the worthwhile tradition of caring for and preserving the humanist heritage and progressive achievements of mankind from past centuries. Part of this tradition is dealing with the early middle-class revolution of German history and with Martin Luther, his work and impact on our own times. The Cultural League also sees its challenge in giving to as many classes and levels of the population from all age groups and professions as possible access to history and culture and in contributing to a deeper historical consciousness. In this sense the conference was a prelude to the Cultural League's Luther tribute and it supported the league's aim to promote research, findings and knowledge in the logical progress of historical and social development for the benefit of individuals and society.

The time of the conference was well chosen--almost 1 year to the day before the reformer's 500th birthday and only a few days after the statements published by the GDR Martin Luther Committee on the status of the preparations for the anniversary. On that occasion, Dr Guenter Wirth, vice president of the Cultural League, had already mentioned the Halle conference and had said that the Cultural League, as the organization of all persons active and interested in culture, wants to expand in exact and popularized fashion the knowledge of historical events, social effects and artistic consequences.

The league is especially interested in explaining the overlapping points of view in the Luther tribute. These points are particularly important during the deepening phase of historical consciousness as well as during the struggle of a unified peace movement and the efforts for the implementation of social progress.

In his introductory address Prof Dr Adolf Laube of the Central Institute for History at the GDR Academy of Sciences pointed out that our concept of progress provides us with the central criterion for evaluating historical personalities and events; according to this criterion Martin Luther's achievement has been exceptional, especially in its progressive effect outside Germany, even if for Luther, as for hardly any other historical personality, subjective intention and objective effect are so clearly separated and even if no other personality in history shows in his influence so many varieties of reverence on the one hand and abuse on the other because the motives of people who revere him are just as varied as the motives of those who condemn him. In this connection we would like to refer the reader to Adolf Laube's contribution "Luther and Our Traditions" in SONNTAG [Sunday] 44/82.

Hans Pischner said that the concern for heritage by the Cultural League has always been a part of a practical policy of alliance that accepts different assumptions, promotes mutual understanding of these ideas and finally arrives at today's image of Luther without denying or obliterating Marxist or theological positions.

The conference was an example of this policy. Therefore, the following excerpts from the paper read by church historian Dr Kurt Nowak are intended to stimulate or challenge our thoughts and to promote a creative exchange of opinions on Luther's concept of man in relation to that of our Marxist social sciences.

In future issues we will publish excerpts from other papers, C.G.

Luther often expressed opinions about man and incorporated these opinions with great flexibility into the most different kinds of literary forms: addresses, disputations, provocative pamphlets, sermons, letters. Basically Luther's image of man is part of his theology and cannot be separated from this background unless it is presented in considerably shortened form.

The texts in which the wealth of Luther's anthropological thoughts are condensed are the commentaries to the letter [of Paul] to the Galatians (1519 and 1531), the treatise "On the Freedom of a Christian," the lectures "Ecclesiastes Salomonis cum annotationibus" [Solomon's Book of Ecclesiastes with Annotations] (1526), the "Ennaration Psalmi LI" [Commentaries on Psalm 51] (1532), the "Disputatio de homine" [Treatise on Man] (1536) and the extensive lectures on the book of Genesis begun at almost the same time (1535-1545). Other texts like the Antinomian Disputations contain additional materials. To all these texts must be added the remaining writings of Luther. The immediate reality of life influenced his theology and anthropology so effectively that theological definitions of the greatest clarity are often intermingled with popular expressions. "Property ownership results in high spirits, high spirits in pride, pride in poverty, poverty in pain." Or: "Be silent, suffer, keep to yourself and bear up, do not complain to anybody, do not despair of God, good fortune may come any day" (L.1976 H. 1.24.32). Theological experiences enter a broad spectrum of empirical observations. No social class or level and no aspect of human life, from childhood to old age, are excluded. In this regard, Luther's work is a compendium of the history of humanity and culture of an almost unique extent.

Seen from the point of view of the history of man, Luther dealt with a segment covering approximately 6,000 years and with all the experiences contained in it. Of special importance to him in this thesaurus were the Old and New Testament, ancient philosophers, the body of traditions of ancient church dogmas with their obligatory symbols, the educational theories of his time and humanism.

Decisive for Luther, however, was a basic existentialist experience from which he then interpreted traditional material in a new way...

#### Man from the Philosophical Point of View

Luther does not underestimate man's philosophical knowledge; this attitude in general agrees with his appreciation of human reason, as long as this reason stays within its natural boundaries. As Luther says in "Disputatio de homine," philosophy knows about the material cause of man (*causa materialis*), it knows less about his soul (*causa formalis*) and it is aware of a *causa finalis*: peace on earth. But, Luther says, it knows nothing about the true *causa efficiens* (God). A definite line then marks the domain of reason; i.e., philosophy. Its domain is man between birth and death, natural man...Natural man is material man equipped with the powers of senses and reason, such as he appears within the confines of his beginning and his end, birth and death. This man is the subject matter of experimental, empirical anthropology. Philosophy should take care to remain within these boundaries and not change over to metaphysical and theological speculations.



Luther has a positive appraisal of man in all of his life activities ranging from sexuality and family to professional and community life. Even though natural man is aware of his inner ambiguity, of the struggle between flesh and spirit, good and evil, this aspect does not take a pessimistic form from the point of view of the natural states of man and world. In this respect Luther also talks about a relative independence of human life activities, social orders and history.

This explains why Luther enters into a considerable range of arguments on subjects that are not considered immediately related to theology. Within the sociological framework of the 16th century, Luther makes observations and often combines these with concrete reform proposals that aim at more equitable relations in the reality of human life; e.g., in the fields of economy and politics. Luther's sermons and writings are filled with social and political commentaries...

#### Man Before God

It is generally believed that the decisive breakthrough of Luther's reform is in part based on his radical appreciation of man's experience of sin and death and of his realization of being struck by the stigma of alienation and evil: sola fide et sola gratia [through faith alone and through grace alone]. The God of wrath, the punishing and judging God who drove the religious scruples of the monk Luther to the point of depressive self-disparagement is now the lovingly condescending God who through his son is in solidarity with man.

#### To Live as a Christian

The topic of living as a Christian has never been for Luther an accidental matter that will find its own solution. Among his earliest and at the same time most mature writings is the "Sermon on Good Works," written at the request of Spalatin (1520), a summation of Christian life on the basis of the theology of the Reformation, a piece of writing that for a long time has unjustly been set aside in favor of the popular pamphlet "On the Freedom of a Christian." One main theme of the sermon is "faith must be the producer and guide in all good works."

Love, hope, sincere confidence--these are the main topics of the sermon. Luther no longer knows any difference between a reverent and an irreverent life, between reverent and irreverent spheres of living and activity. The godliness of God, newly exalted by Luther, corresponds to the worldliness of the world. The world is not to be overcome by a monastic way of life, is not to be idealized as in the republic of educated men according to the designs of Erasmus of Rotterdam, is not to be constructed in dreams as in the Utopia designed by Thomas More, the friend of Erasmus and Luther. The world is the totality of all essential human characteristics in family, society, state, nature and history. It is the creation of God entrusted to the formative strength of man.

In a modern interpretation the world is understood as a sacred space (cosmos) prepared by God, within which the history of man takes place. At the threshold of modern times, history itself begins to become the encompassing horizon of the knowledge of reality. The world is seen as a huge potential and material field given to man for cultivation...Very impressive is the argumentative strength with which Luther in this sermon, which was composed in a brief space of time, channels his ideas into all areas of life--from prayer and the order of religious services to business practices and the education of children. Luther's Christian ethics shows its largest dimension in focusing on God as the one revealed "per passiones and crucem" [through sufferings and the cross] and in challenging Christians to be true followers of Christ in their lives. Faced with the voluntary self-humiliation of God's son, it becomes impossible for a Christian to be arrogant or to consider himself superior "to the most useless or ignoble person on earth." This concept robs social elitism, which has been so unfortunate for the history of mankind, of its foundation. No less profound is the realization that a Christian gains a new social quality that aims for mutual selflessness. Luther said that we not only should not crave our neighbor's property but also should be supportive to him in every respect.

Luther, however, remains realistic in his ethics. The state of a community living with the experience of the restoration and love of God must remain a kind of utopia not only because its members are "mere humans" who must be forced to observe order and civil law but also because of the Christians themselves. Which one of them could claim to be perfect? In this imperfect world with its imperfect people, whether they are Christians or non-Christians, there must be at all times a system of civil order, there must be firm and reasonable rules that serve law and justice in the world sense.

#### Luther's Concept of Man Today

Like nobody else in church history, except perhaps Aurelius Augustinus, Luther crossed thresholds and opened doors to new rooms. His concept of man is close to us because of its unshakable realism. Realism is not pessimism, which considers man an unsuccessful experiment of creation and without further perspective delivers him to the technocratic management of his misfortune. Realism is likewise not that kind of moralism that would like to accept man only as he should be but is helpless in view of the difficult road that must be taken. We are close to Luther's theology with its promises of eventual success in our human destiny, even if a non-Christian would not be able to rely on the theological conditions of such achievement...

The "Freedom of the Children of God" and the philosophical concepts of freedom from Aristotle to Karl Marx are certainly not identical. There are differences in principle between the theological and philosophical concepts of man. But inasmuch as Christian faith shows man as the creation of God, as the goal of redemption and perfection through God, and considers every man as endowed with values that imply obligation, it becomes clear that humanist goals in philosophy and Christian faith have a certain fraternal relation even though their backgrounds may look different.



In our time the question about the concept of man has received a new impetus of elementary importance. No longer is this question asked within the framework of individualism as in the age of enlightenment and during the 19th century. When we look at Africa, South America and Asia, the question is one of equal rights for all races, of national identity and free access for all people to the wealth of their countries. Likewise, the threat of a European or global holocaust does not simply imply the fears and hopes of the individual. Individual destiny can no longer be separated from generic destiny. The individual cannot escape into imaginary niches of history.

Against this background, Luther's experience of salvation gains new importance for us. The fate of the human race is promised a good ending because of God's acts of salvation. It is not possible to transfer in a naive fashion this experience of faith to the process of history. But impulses of encouragement that come from this experience, the hope that it gives and the challenge that it evokes point the way to the future.

#### Luther-Muentzer 'Dialectical Unity'

East Berlin SONNTAG in German Vol 36 No 44, 31 Oct 82 p 7

[Article by Prof Dr Adolf Laube, program director, Central Institute for History, GDR Academy of Sciences; member, Martin Luther Committee: "The Reformer--His Historical Achievement and the Cultivation of His Legacy in the GDR--Luther and Our Tradition"]

[Text] In his speech before the GDR Martin Luther Committee, Erich Honecker pointed out: "To the progressive traditions that we care for and continue belong the actions and the legacy of all those who contributed to the progress and development of world culture regardless of their social or class relations." In his speech at the conference of social scientists in December 1980, Kurt Hager stated: "There are no 'completed' questions in history. It must always be investigated anew under today's conditions and demands. This has absolutely nothing to do with an 'opportunistic interpretation' of history. Our concept of history is by no means limited to the mere century and a half since the formation of the working class and to the work of this, our class. The socialist GDR is the objective result of German history in its total course, from its beginnings. In this sense, the GDR is the crowning achievement of a century-old struggle of all the progressive forces of the German people..."

This approach to the problems of traditions and legacies is also the basis for our interest in Martin Luther. In all societies the relation to heritage and tradition is always determined by class aspects. From the point of view of our own class we sort out the heritage handed down by history into parts that are worth preserving--from which we receive legitimacy, from which we learn and that we want to continue--and into parts that we refuse to accept and even oppose. Our own class viewpoint determines the traditions, the historical roots, lineages, examples and values that connect our position today with the past. These traditions are not unchangeable. They change with the development of today's social conditions and within the international class struggle. The

ruling working class that represents the interests of the entire society has a relation to the past that is different from that of the working class struggling against the ruling classes of exploiters. In addition, our knowledge of history has considerably expanded, deepened and changed on the basis of our own research.

#### Shadings

The Luther image of the past was frequently influenced by Luther's attitude toward the Peasants War and by the subsequent ties of the Lutheran movement to the reactionary ruling classes. After the peasants' revolt had been crushed, Luther's contemporaries already saw in him primarily the church reformer obedient to authorities and the founder of a new confession of faith; his revolutionary impacts were disregarded. Later, Luther and his movement were used especially by reactionary forces to stabilize the late feudal and imperialist class rule through the confederation of throne and altar but were likewise used by the reform forces in the labor movement to publicize the reform efforts of integrating the masses of the people into existing social orders through political and social concessions, efforts that were considered the only possible alternatives to force and revolution. Many positive impulses also emanated from Luther. The enlightenment and classical philosophy, democratic middle-class forces and fighters of the antifascist resistance tied their activities to Luther and the positive traditions connected with him. Thus the scope of the Luther image was always very broad; it shows many shadings of reaction from veneration on the one hand to condemnation on the other. The motives of those who pay tribute to him are just as different as the motives of those who condemn him.

Since Marx and Engels there exists for us a completely different Luther image, which proceeds from the objective criteria of historical materialism and does justice to the progressive achievements and impacts of Luther, as well as to his contradictions and class-imposed limitations. This image is characterized especially by Friedrich Engels' realization that in Germany the Reformation and the Peasants War meant the "revolution number 1 of the middle class" and that Luther provided the lightning bolt that set the revolution on fire. In this sense, the releasing action of Luther assumed a world-historical dimension. Karl Marx said emphatically: "Germany's revolutionary past is theoretical, it is the Reformation. As once it was the monk so now it is philosophy in whose brain the revolution begins." At the same time, Marx and Engels pointed out Luther's time and class limitations: how he stood still on the middle-class positions of his time and how he was overtaken by the revolutionary popular movement that found its ideologist in Thomas Muentzer.

Luther belongs to the traditions of the rising middle class with all its contradictions, a class that under the specific German conditions of the early 16th century developed a strong tendency to lean on the ambitious regional rulers. Friedrich Engels pointed out that at that time "the monarchy was the progressive element," that the middle class and all revolutionary forces depended on a federation with the monarchy. This situation was different from,

let us say, England and France, where there was a strong monarchical central power that in federation with, or based on, the middle class eliminated specific feudal forces opposing it, limited the political influence of the universal power of the papal church and promoted the national development of a middle class. Compared to these monarchies the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation had lost this kind of power long ago. This empire's universalist orientation toward the outside no longer offered a national or unified alternative for the territorial policies of the regional princes. But because the middle class still needed the protection of state authorities, great parts of the German middle class sought support from the rising territorial powers and so did Martin Luther.

#### Worldwide Impact

Our relationship to this class tradition--which certainly is not the tradition of the working class--is understood in terms of the Marxist-Leninist theory of development and revolution according to which this middle class and its rebellion against such a central institution of the feudal system as the papal church at that time gave impetus to national development and contributed to social progress. The concept of progress gives the central criterion for evaluating historical personalities and events; according to this criterion Martin Luther's achievement is valuable and had progressive impact even beyond the borders of Germany.

Luther's progressive, even revolutionary, impact came especially from his theology. Because the total concept of world order was based on theological considerations, it could be overthrown under those conditions only by theological methods. Driven by personal fears for the salvation of his soul--which reflect the general mood of crisis and uncertainty of his time--Luther developed a theology that called for a direct relationship between man and God. Up to his time, the management of this relationship had been in the hands of the church alone; this gave the church tremendous power in addition to its material power as the largest feudal landowner and manager of worldly authority: to the greatest possible degree the church determined the social consciousness and conduct of man. This monopoly was used by the church to sanction feudal class relationships and to legitimize and stabilize the existing feudal society.

In view of these conditions, Luther's theology, which challenged the existence of the church as an institution, had to result in revolutionary social consequences in the crisis situation of the 16th century. His theology shook up the international center of the feudal system--as Friedrich Engels calls the papal church--not only in its dogmatic logic; it also took away this system's legitimate position as manager of social relations. The elimination of the rights of the papal church and the destruction of church property would have resulted, in addition, in a basic change of traditional property structures and political power relationships, while the elimination of the many contributions exacted by the church would have been in the interest of the middle class and of large segments of the population.

Luther replaced the church with the Bible as the manifestation of divine will. This concept had a thoroughly revolutionary impact because the Bible had originated in completely different social conditions and in its light many conditions in church and society had to appear corrupt and could therefore be rejected as illegal. The Luther Bible was therefore the most important basis of argument for the revolutionaries in the Peasants War.

In conditions of deep social crisis, Luther's attacks on the Roman church met with widespread response. The attacks captured the masses and thus became a material force and the beginning of a revolution. Luther could not have been conscious of all this but his attacks on the economic, political and ideological power position of the Roman church challenged the question of power, the central question of any revolution; he did this in a sense of shifting power relations in favor of the secular authorities, the urban upper classes and power sharing by the middle classes. All this paved the way for an early development of absolutism. The revolution that later included broad segments of the population that during the Peasants War took up the battle even against secular feudalism, was a middle-class revolution because it was caused by the contradictions at the beginning of the transitional period from feudalism to capitalism and it could speed this transition; it was an early form of middle-class revolution because it started under still undeveloped subjective and objective conditions. We therefore call it an early middle-class revolution.

#### Social Demands

Luther's theological attack on the Roman church was the decisive impulse that limited the Reformation to the attack on church dogmas. From the beginning, Martin Luther combined biblically founded church politics with a bundle of political, social and economic problems in which the deep social contradictions of his time were expressed. With the Bible as his basis he searched for solutions of these problems. These problems included such questions as the purchase of interests and leases, a practice that was then the most effective method of exploiting broad levels of the population. He dealt with measures against the notorious practices of begging by ethically upgrading physical labor, by prohibiting begging for all who were able to work and by creating social relief funds for people unable to work: the old, orphans and the sick. Luther turned against the large capitalist companies, which he called "monopolia," and in doing so he also criticized the attitude of princes and rulers who did not fulfill their obligations to promote the common good.

The writings of Martin Luther show that socioeconomic reform ideas as well as political concepts belong to the essential character of the Reformation and cannot be separated artificially from religious-theological concepts. The Reformation did not cause the Peasants War; this was done, in fact, by the social, economic and political conflicts existing in society. But inasmuch as the Reformation took up these conflict issues and proved many of the abuses in church and society to be un-Christian according to the standards of the gospel and, especially, shook up the old church, it laid the decisive foundations on which the revolutionaries of 1522 could build and which made the uprising on such a large scale possible in the first place.

## The Peasants War

It is necessary, however, to separate clearly subjective intentions and objective impact. Subjectively Luther never wanted the rebellion. His basic conviction was that a change in social conditions could be brought about only by worldly authorities who derived their power from God. Force directed against these authorities is therefore of satanic origin and must be rejected most strongly. Since 1522 he warned repeatedly to be aware of riot and revolution. His attitude during the Peasants War was therefore the logical result of his basic theological concepts.

Nevertheless, the revolutionaries set their hopes on Luther. They too were deeply religious. Even the most radical programs of the Peasants War considered legal only the measures that could be justified through the gospel.

Luther came out against the struggling peasants and demanded the unconditional suppression of the uprising. Nevertheless, all the essential social and economic demands of the rebels were given a biblical foundation. And in this lies the important historical achievement of Thomas Muentzer--that he overcame Luther's class barriers, combined the political aspirations of the Reformation directly with the social demands of the masses and developed the ideology of a people's reformation. The revolutionary Thomas Muentzer was likewise primarily a theologian. But from his theological concepts he drew different class-oriented conclusions than Martin Luther. Even though they were on opposite sides in the class struggle, both Luther and Muentzer belong to the dialectic system that we call the early middle-class revolution. Both represented different class positions in the revolution and both had basically different ideas about the ways that would change conditions. Their basic attitude determined the different, class-oriented receptions that they received later; in this the ruling classes deliberately underplayed Luther's revolutionary impact.

In the GDR, capitalist class rule has been overcome once and all; the working class has the power and represents the developing socialist state. In its concepts of heritage and tradition this class has therefore also a completely different relation to the revolutionary achievements of the German middle class during its phase of ascent. Thus it is completely legitimate if we include Luther--in spite of his class oriented limitations and our critical appraisal of his attitude in the Peasants War--in the revolutionary and progressive traditions of German history that the GDR has accepted into its character and if we give him a place of honor without lessening in the least the firm place that Muentzer has in our concept of tradition.

8889

CSO: 2300/96



TRADE UNION LEADERS MOBILIZE MEMBERS TO BACK TOUGH GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

Budapest NEPSZAVA in Hungarian 24 Dec 82 p 3

[Article by Gyula Virizlay, SZOT [National Council of Trade Unions] secretary: "Everything Here Happens for Them and With Them"]

[Text] We already know what our tasks are on the nationwide scale in 1983, since next year's program of our economic operation was adopted by the National Assembly a week ago. This is a tough program which does not tolerate looking for excuses and does not show anyone the easier end of things. The trade unions knew this even when they announced their advance support for the plan, and when they agreed to contribute with all their strength--with the mobilization of the nearly 5 million trade union membership--to the successful execution of more difficult economic tasks than before. If we do not do this, we are fooling ourselves. That is, any opinion which leaves the realities grossly out of consideration would cause irreparable damage.

But the responsibility of the trade unions cannot be limited to understanding and accepting the circumstances, the realities and the goals. As the largest mass organization, the trade unions must also accept an outstandingly large part in helping the workers understand and accept these realities and the goals built upon them. In turn, the key question in this regard is: Can we perform our work in such a way as for it to be free of generalities, can we reach the individual people, and will the trade union's work affect mobilization? The activity and growth of the trade unions gives us the right to say responsibly that we can. But at the same time the problems of growth also emphatically underline that in order to do so we will now have to do many things differently.

The Greatest Force Is Agreement of the Workers

The role of people is the definitive key question of activity work, too. It is particularly important now to inform, influence, convince and urge on the workers day after day, and to strengthen in them the faith and confidence in our policies. This can be accomplished only in closeness with people. The permanent main question of the entire trade union movement, to accomplish its efforts together with the workers, is receiving new impetus now. An individual approach is needed before decisions, when we coordinate things and develop our standpoints, when we concretely define tasks for execution, for mobilizations which help implementation and for work competition.

In this, our main allies are the trade union stewards who live together and work together with their fellow workers. We are now asking them almost on a daily basis to make the workers relate to the workers what we want and that they should be sensitive to what the workers want and signal this to us. In this way, the people can see our principles implemented in practice and become convinced that the measures are serving their interests. And the recognition will strengthen confidence in the policies and bring additional energies to the surface. We should free these energies and put them at the service of implementing our goals.

The greatest force in our society is agreement of the workers with our goals and methods. This provides a relaxed, helpful and understanding political backdrop and ensures active participation in carrying out tasks. When workers debate and reason about wages or social issues, about work organization, work supply, or evaluate on the basis of work done, in their groups and with the leadership of the trade unions steward, the strength of the community is being increased and its morale is being shaped. They are recognizing and encouraging human values which are considered important and rejecting other, negative, human characteristics. Meanwhile, agreement has developed in the affairs of larger or smaller communities. And at the same time, millions are sensing and understanding that it makes sense to work better, more efficiently.

#### We Are Helping Implement Good Policies

Every day, most of the half a million trade union officials are meeting with the membership, are sensing the problems and joys of the workers, and can also take measures when that is necessary. What takes place in the basic organizations, the trade union groups [locals], is definitive in shaping their living and working conditions. It is also important for more and more people to recognize how directly the events of international life influence the way their individual lives are shaped. They should feel that in the present economic situation we must work differently from before, and with their independent and courageous initiatives they should contribute to solving the problems. In the enterprise's planning and economic operation, they should exhibit the same care they have gotten used to exercising in their own households.

In this country, it is an important task of the trade union movement to help understand and recognize the well founded nature of our economic tasks and to support the implementation of our tasks with all its might, and together with this, guard the preservation of achievements made in the living and working conditions of the workers. The trade union's behavior stands on clear and open theoretical foundations on these issues, too. Its activity is guided by being a part, and one of the responsible parties, of the workers' rule, of implementing the interests of our entire society and of protecting the interests of the workers.

We consciously profess it to be the task of the trade unions to aid, represent and convert into deeds the policies of the working class. This is an even stronger, an even more indispensable requirement today, and

requires greater knowledge and qualitatively better, more, and more responsible work from us. We are helping in the implementation of good policies proven by life itself, and we have the means and the strength for it. We also have the appropriate rights and enjoy the respect to do it. Yet, what is missing? That we take advantage of the opportunities in accordance with today's needs. For implementation, it is necessary for a way of thinking which "considers society" to develop at the place of work. This is not an automatic process. It is the obligation of the trade union to help "see and let see" the daily work and society's efforts, the present and the future. To help recognize what is new: in planning, in organization and in the work processes. And to help take a stand against negligence, disinterest, irresponsibility and lack of know-how. These efforts of ours also meet with the needs, intentions, and sense of fairness of the workers. Thus, we should endeavor to make the "greater policies" be recognizably and understandably present at the workplace. Therefore, we are working on all tasks deriving from the calling of the trade unions with the care appropriate to the weight of our responsibility. One cannot live up to this calling in a manner abstract from life. We should learn to handle life in its multitude of colors and richness. This is the essence of the trade union's work. If they just want to "acknowledge" this, if they just consider this "to be check-marked," that will only result in greyness and formalisms, something which becomes contrary and breeds indifference.

Lively contact with the masses cannot tolerate the characteristics of formalism in trade union work. Our task is not to chase after outward appearances and numbers, but to implement activities full of life in close relationship with the working masses. By merely defining the tasks, specifying mandatory plan numbers and formalistic methods, we cannot develop the faith, activity and enthusiasm the working masses have placed in our goals. The most noble goal ever to stand before the Hungarian workers--building socialism--calls for the most noble tools and methods.

#### Work Is the Measuring Stick

An individual approach is also needed in socialist work competition in order to overcome formal and bureaucratic characteristics. In our current practice, the role, opportunity and obligations of the individual cannot always be seen behind the pledges of the brigade and other communities. This is also one of the reasons for the formalism of the competition. This is why the work and the real value of the pledges of some people cannot be judged with fairness. But the value of work can be the only measuring stick in evaluating competition, paying wages and all types of financial and moral recognition.

Before shaping their pledges, the collectives must realistically evaluate what they can expect from their members. With this knowledge, the pledges can be specifically defined, implementation helped, and performance evaluated and recognized on better foundations. The working collective itself is the most suitable forum for organizing, aiding and evaluating individualized work and work competition.



The shop meetings and trade union group conferences are living forms of democratic communal thinking. We often see their value, but also meet their concerns and problems. Often routineness and apathy stifle the thinking process, render forums formal and boring, and suffocate even good suggestions. We should also question whether only the customary forums can bring values to the surface! The things which happen every day, which we suggest every day--even without forums--are those not values? These very everyday solutions make our work complete and strengthen communal thinking and democratism.

A good atmosphere at the workplace, enrichment of relationships between people, good relationships between superiors and subordinates are indispensable, but the more, the better should also make sense and command respect. Those should receive more who did more to improve us, those should be surrounded by recognition who work honestly, who learn and teach others, and who also accept sacrifices for the common good. Democratism implemented in everyday practice is also the best tool to increasingly overcome the hindering, apolitical and even cynical behavior, and for the active and committed behavior which also accepts sacrifices to become definitive everywhere.

Work that is worthy of man is an elementary condition of a life that is worthy of man. To achieve good quality requires not only a knowledgeable worker but also discipline, a sense of responsibility and conscious willingness to act. A faulty product is not respected even by the person who made it. Lax discipline harms society. It is, therefore, not immaterial whom the unique value-measuring atmosphere of the workplace surrounds with recognition--the person who does honest work and acts in the interest of the common good, or the one who tries to cleverly maneuver around and performs his job with negligence. It is not immaterial whether the work of the person who thinks soberly and realistically, or the word of someone else, is valued and respected in the community.

People cannot be forced to travel the path of the development of socialist man, but still the community's atmosphere does represent a kind of moral force. There are things that cannot be done in a good collective, even if the law does not forbid it. The moral atmosphere of a healthy collective rejects lack of discipline, laziness, drinking or roughness. It is a good thing and should be supported if this "moral compulsion" carries the people in a good direction. In the socialist brigade movement, we see thousands of examples of helping each other in work, in study, in solving family problems and community concerns. The educating effect of workplace collectives has been pointed in the direction of developing and strengthening the characteristics of socialist man.

#### The Stewards Have Grown up to Their Tasks

The trade union movement has always had and still has workers who make sacrifices for others. They are not stingy with their time or money. With their examples they demonstrate that one can work "exactly and well."

and that it is worth it, and that income is not the only benefit derived from work. One can build on them, and their fellow workers to pay attention to their words. Those trade union stewards who work in the movement in a manner worthy of their name and function, are also such people.

The trade union's work aimed at individuals can be accomplished only through the stewards. We have adjusted the sphere of authority, rights and tasks of the trade union stewards to the requirement of everyday presence. We would also like to approximate their work methods, work style to this natural requirement. At one time, the steward had rank, and he has it again today. The value of the steward's title is greater and greater. His word had significance even before he received "rank," and they listen to him even more today because he has grown up to his rights and tasks. We can say with every right that the steward is the number one representative of the trade union movement, the one who "represents the trade union before the people, and is the spokesman of his fellow workers in the trade union."

The stewards who have real respect and are effective are those who learn of the opinions and problems of their fellow workers not only in group meetings, those who meet the suggestions and signals of their fellow workers awaiting measures to be taken not only at group meetings. Even the machine, the desk must not hide the steward from his group, and it is important that he see and feel the group everywhere, too. He works, lives and breathes together with his group. He is first among equals, one who accepts an obligation and service for his fellow workers and for their cause.

Coordinating differing opinions and developing a common will is no simple matter. At times the tensions, the differences of opinion are sharper than we were used to earlier. It is, therefore, important to build better on the opinions of the affected parties before decisions are made, and the need is greater to thoroughly familiarize ourselves with the facts and evaluate them in a considered manner.

The steward relates to his fellow workers by close working ties. His primary attention is not paid to formalities, but rather he builds on natural human relations. He may argue and coordinate before the decisions, and he has the opportunity to regularly inform, convince and mobilize his fellow workers. In all questions worth considering, he can come to agreement with his fellow workers, and he works together with them in the interest of implementing their common cause.

The influence and respect of the trade unions is developed and shaped in the practice of everyday events, when our announced principles are contrasted with the experience of practice. Our plans and goals become realities at the workplace, our principles are realized there. It is necessary for conscious work that everyone recognize our problems, understand our plans, and see his or her own role and opportunity in the implementation.

We are endeavoring to obtain the agreement of 5 million workers. During the course of this effort, we meet a million different kinds of people and familiarize ourselves with even more efforts, intentions and problems.

Answers, help, measures, and initiatives are expected from us for that many different kinds of questions. All this must be solved simply and quickly, so that the workers may see and feel the effect and sense of our work. Trade union work means solving very many everyday problems. But through this it helps learn and feel in practice that the work performed by the individual, the enterprise's activity and implementation of society's goals form a unified whole.

The trade unions want to develop an environment at the workplace and also outside of it in which every man can work and live with a good feeling, and where committed behavior has respect. They are working on making the people feel well, and experience every day that everything here happens for them and with them.

8584

CSO: 2500/92

PHILOSOPHER VIEWS SOLIDARITY AS ANTI-SOVIET REVOLUTION

Paris LE MATIN in French 13 Dec 82 p 17

[Article by Leszek Kolakowski: "The Wound in the System Will Not Heal"]

[Text] Does the Solidarity movement point toward the breakup of the Soviet system? This question is asked by Leszek Kolakowski, the most famous Polish philosopher.

A leading participant in the 1956 rebellion, Kolakowski was removed from his chair in 1968. He went into exile in Great Britain and now works at Oxford. The text we are publishing here is the second part of Kolakowski's contribution to the seminar on Polish culture held in Paris this weekend.

The great malaise in communist Poland on the eve of the events in 1980 did not stem solely from the fact that the Polish people were deprived of their homeland, that they were no longer in their own country or rather, that their own home was occupied by a foreigner whose permission had to be asked even to go to the bathroom.

The malaise mainly resulted from the fact that the foreigner, who had not been invited, demanded to be loved, to be adored, like an older brother. And also because it had in its service powerful organs made up of Poles responsible for staging grotesque spectacles of adulation with the aid of a special ideology which, to make the farce complete, was called scientific Marxism. It was not only the national oppression that was intolerable; it was also and above all the stifling, omnipresent lie (...).

The Polish revolution is a rebellion, not so much against a nation as it is against a foreign civilization, although the two are often confused in people's minds. The reason why, in my opinion, it is not a matter of an anti-Russian struggle, if one is speaking of historical categories, is because Sovietism is anti-Russian (...).

The fact that is not specific to Polish events but that seems to accompany all revolutionary processes is the total break between the civilian society and the machinery in power. It is that break which also reveals the difference between the situation in 1956 and the drama today. Even during the Stalinist period,

despite its atrocities and brutalities, there were at least two aspects of the situation that ensured a degree of communication between the government and society. First of all, at the time, the Communist Party was a party: an organization unified by an idea, mainly made up of people involved in political life because of ideological convictions and who believed in something. Second, there was a widespread feeling that the country, devastated and battered by the war and the Hitlerian occupation, had to be rebuilt and that it was every person's duty to participate, even under the communist government imposed. These two aspects disappeared long ago. The party practically does not exist outside of a wage-earning machine that has lost all illusions and that is made up of cynical opportunists well aware of why they are paid. The party's claims of directing economic life have been compromised for good by the spectacular catastrophes to which its dictatorship has led Poland.

Over and over the participants of the 1980 movement have spoken of a revolution that limits itself. The reasons for that self-limitation are more than obvious. The fact that communism, with all its military and police machinery, could not survive over a week in Poland in the absence of the threat of Soviet tanks is known to everyone, especially the dictator-vicars! Nevertheless, a revolutionary thrust is not normally able to impose such limitations on itself. This peculiarity has certainly been linked to the fact that it was a revolution absolutely without violence. All the violence, previous to August 1980 and thereafter, was used by the government. Another element perhaps played a role also: Throughout the process, we have scarcely seen the type of fantastic illusions that usually accompany revolutionary uprisings. For most of its actors, this harvest was not to mark the dawn of a new day, the coming of the Holy Spirit. It was less a matter of breaking with the past or beginning a new calendar than it was of winning back the past, finding a new link with the historical continuity so brutally broken. In this sense, it was a conservative revolution and Poland is justly proud of it.

Was it a workers' revolution? In one sense, yes. The conflict between workers and management, in this instance, the communist state, gave the explosion its initial dynamism. But the process had been prepared by all kinds of tensions: national, social and cultural, and developed into a broad civil movement in which all social strata: the workers, peasants and intelligentsia, participated actively, all except the political, police and military apparatus, naturally. Insofar as it is permitted to speak of a workers' revolution, one must say this: It was the first workers' revolution in history, since the Bolshevik coup of 1917 in no way deserved the name. Consequently, the first workers' revolution in the world was rising up against a socialist state and took place under the sign of the cross with the blessing of the Pope. That is all one can say about the inevitable historical laws discovered (scientifically) by the Marxists.

One must view the Polish revolution and counterrevolution as overall events whose significance is only revealed within the context of the changes underway in all of East Europe. For the first time, the movement of which Solidarity was the expression had opened a way through which the breakup of the totalitarian institutions of Sovietism could eventually take place step by step, by nonviolent pressure that would snatch from the quasi omnipotent state fields

of cultural, trade union, economic and independent activity and initiative that would crystallize in institutional forms. Is it a dream? No one knows with certainty, but we must note the following: The only alternative to the dream is the continuous expansion of Soviet imperialism, almost fatally leading to the unspeakable horrors of a world war. Europe's hope, if there is one, lies in the move which Poland struggled to make and whose future remains uncertain. For the first time, a communist government has been forced to wage war against its own society under that name, thus demonstrating in a spectacular fashion the total bankruptcy of communism in the economic, ideological and social sense. It is a new and perhaps decisive phase in the history of Sovietism, announcing the collapse of the empire as well as of its ideological foundations.

Whatever happens in the months and years ahead, all the tensions and sources of conflict that devour the Soviet system remain what they were: incurable, insoluble within the system that has sterilized itself and deprived itself of all means of adaptation, even of understanding the world in which it exists. A great deal remains of all the apparent failures which the democratic movements in countries colonized by the empire have suffered. These very defeats reveal the poverty and weakness of the barbaric civilization that decided to conquer the world: All the conditions for rebellion and explosion remain intact. The wounds will not heal. Their presence confirms what we already know: the inevitability of the return.

11,464  
CSO: 3519/260



STATUS OF MINORITIES IN ROMANIAN STATE OF 1918

Bucharest ANALE DE ISTORIE in Romanian No 5, Sep-Oct 82 pp 49-64

/Article by Mircea Musat and Florian Tanasescu: "National Minorities in the Romanian State Unified in 1918"/

/Text/ The year 1918 figures in the history of mankind as a critical point in the formation or completion of the unified and independent national states in central and southeastern Europe, and their formation or restoration in that part of the continent was not due to chance, accident or the "magnanimity" of the great powers of the time. This process was the objective result of the oppressed nations' struggle for their emancipation and development as independent entities in the European family. The postwar peace treaties accordingly legislated the declarations of their wishes made by the masses and legally established the unanimous and freely expressed will of the oppressed peoples in the former multinational empires.

History demonstrated then, as it does today quite convincingly, the overwhelming importance of forming the unified national states as a factor for progress on the scale of the whole European and world community and the constructive and important part they played in solving some complex problems of international relations, as well as their contribution to the development of the material and cultural civilization of mankind.

Due to the prolonged foreign domination over some peoples in this part of Europe, the intensive policy of denationalization pursued by the great absolutist empires and massive colonizations and resettlements of foreign populations for the same purpose, the central and eastern European states (1) included populations of other nationalities within their borders after 1918, the percentages of which differed from one country to another. (2)

The phenomenon is also illustrated by Romania. The population of the unified Romanian state after 1918 included other nationalities such as Hungarians, Germans, Serbs etc. According to the 1930 population census, Romania had 18,052,000 inhabitants as of that date, including 12,983,000 (71.9 percent) Romanians and 5,052,000 (28.1 percent) national minorities\*. Moreover, when new boundary lines were drawn between the states of central and eastern Europe

according to the provisions of the postwar peace treaties, large Romanian populations were left outside Romania's borders. There were about 16,000 Romanians in Hungary, according to some sources, or 0.2 percent of the entire Hungarian population. (3) By other estimates, Hungary had 60,000 Romanian inhabitants after 1918, Czechoslovakia had 14,000 (1.1 percent of its population), Yugoslavia had 135,000 (1.0 percent), Bulgaria had about 200,000, and the Ukraine had 250,724. (4)

The existence of the minorities in the central and eastern European states did not change their uniform national character but reflected the age-old endurance of the peoples in that part of the continent, who created their own destinies and their own material and cultural life despite the vicissitudes of the times.

United Romania faced highly complex problems, but it found its natural path of development by unifying its material and cultural resources on the national level and by exerting its efforts internally to enhance its new economic and social-political potentials and externally to defend and consolidate the postwar status-quo, to create a climate of peace and international understanding, and to collaborate with all countries of the world extensively and effectively.

The united Romanian state based its foreign policy on the principle of unrestricted collaboration with any country, regardless of its size or its economic and military strength. On that principle, as soon as World War I was over Romania began to explore the possibilities of normalizing its relations with Soviet Russia, Hungary and Bulgaria, established cooperative relations with Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Turkey and Greece (having very long-standing ties with those peoples), consolidated its traditional relations with England and France, and strove to expand its field of collaboration with other countries. (5)

In connection with Romanian-Hungarian relations, however, the course of some events in Hungary, the inflexible attitude of the leadership of that country in its relations with the Romanian state, and some stands taken by the Romanian governments of the time created an atmosphere of distrust, suspicion and tension in the relations between the two countries.

Before the state frontiers between Romania and Hungary were definitively determined after the conclusion of World War I, the well-known military incidents took place that were followed by the occupation of Budapest and part of Hungary's territory by Romanian troops. (6) The incidents were due to the continuation, with the same violence, of the massacres of the peaceful Romanian population left outside the provisional boundary set by the Armistice Convention and to the Hungarian revolutionary government's threats of armed intervention against Romania, followed by the Hungarian Red Army's offensive against the Romanian Army that was opened on 19-20 July 1919. (7) All this was aggravated by the stand taken against unified Romania by Soviet Russia and the Soviet Ukraine, which demanded the evacuation of Bessarabia and Bucovina by an ultimatum. (8) The attack upon the Romanian Army opened by the Hungarian troops created a hazardous situation dangerous to the Romanian state, wherefore Romania took military action to counteract the Hungarian Army's offensive.

The Romanian military administration in Hungary, installed after the conclusion of the hostilities, was not repressive or rapacious, as that of the Central Powers was during the temporary occupation of part of Romania during World War I



or as that of Horthyite Hungary in northwest Romania after the Dictate of Vienna would prove to be. General Holban, the governor of Budapest, solved the very urgent problem of feeding the population, restored the civil rights and freedoms annulled during the revolution, granted freedom of the press, favored reopening the public institutions and enterprises, authorized resumption of theatrical performances, etc. As one person very familiar with the situation at the time pointed out, "This effort on behalf of order was duly appreciated by the Hungarian public. Despite the hardship of seeing their country and capital occupied ... the public's relations with the army of occupation were very courteous and even cordial." (9)

Similar acknowledgments were also made by the Hungarian Social-Democratic leaders Erno Garami and Karoly Peyer who, in a conversation on 30 September 1919 with the Romanian envoy in Budapest, C. Diamandy, expressed their appreciation of the regime instituted in Hungary by the Romanian military authorities. The two Hungarian Social-Democrats said they were afraid that if the Romanian troops suddenly left the capital (Budapest -- our note) the White Guard and the reactionary elements would indulge in excesses and persecutions." (10)

The two Hungarian Social-Democratic leaders' fears proved justified, for shortly after the withdrawal of the Romanian troops from Hungary the reactionary circles placed Admiral Miklos Horthy in command of Hungary in March 1920, who was to inaugurate the first fascist dictatorship in Europe and initiate an openly revisionist policy toward Romania as well as other states in the area.

Romania did not follow the new course of Hungary's foreign policy but tried to attenuate the differences and tension and establish a climate of collaboration between the two states. Either on its own or in collaboration with its allies in the Little Entente, Romania made diplomatic overtures directly or through the League of Nations to establish good neighbor relations with Hungary. Jointly with Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia the Romanian state helped Hungary in the League of Nations to obtain a loan to overcome the economic difficulties it was facing, on the express condition that this loan would not be used for armament or irridentist propaganda. (11) Meanwhile Romania tried to normalize diplomatic relations and to promote economic ties with Hungary, with the idea of creating an atmosphere of detente and cooperation between the two countries. And thanks to these efforts the legations of Hungary and Romania in Bucharest and Budapest respectively were reopened, meaning that diplomatic relations between the two countries were resumed.

In the spirit of its traditional foreign policy, Romania also took steps to place its relations with other states as well on a principled, mutually advantageous basis, while helping to construct a system of collective security that would prevent and control violations of international treaties and standards and guarantee peace and free development of every people.

From the experience of a past fraught with sufferings caused by the policies pursued by the great empires of the time, Romania proceeded to consolidate its national unity in the desire to create a broad democratic framework for all its citizens regardless of nationality. The Romanians had no intention of depriving the inhabitants of other ethnic origins of rights or freedoms but afforded them the same conditions of existence and intellectual expression that they

themselves enjoyed. This showed a mature understanding of their role as "men of the soil" permanently attached to their homeland, who from their higher moral viewpoint of a profoundly humanitarian nature could not refuse to respect the natural rights of those who had settled alongside them and coexisted with the for centuries.

Accordingly the unified Romanian state was built upon democratic foundations. In the extensive discussions in the press and political organizations it was recommended as a matter of course that full civil rights and freedoms be accorded the national minorities.\* Grigore Antipa concluded in 1919 that "The future Romanian state must be so organized that every nationality will find in it its fatherland and not its enemy. Only when a *modus vivendi* is found will every nationality contribute its culture and special aptitudes to the progress of the whole (people -- our note) and increase its educational power." (12) Another noted scholar, the linguist Sextil Puscariu, pointed out that "We must not forget that we have a large number of Hungarian fellow citizens with whom we must live without conflicts. The Romanian people's sound political instinct decided at Alba Iulia what our policy toward the national minorities must be. Those who had tasted plentifully of the bitter bread of the oppressed decreed absolute tolerance when they were becoming masters." (13) In a similar spirit Gala Galaction declared, "It is in our best interest not to tear out the eyes of anyone of foreign origin but to let him take spiritual roots among us. That is the only way we shall consolidate Romania." (14) In his turn Ion Nistor maintained that "We must find a just and satisfactory solution to the language problem... We must recognize every ethnic minority's right to cultivate its language and to open its schools." In a broader sense, Romul Boila concluded that "Recognition of the right to the mother tongue, even for the communities of citizens of other nationalities, must be a fundamental principle in the new constitution, in accordance with the decisions of the National Assembly at Alba Iulia. The most liberal way to solve the minorities problem will be to guarantee the minorities, in the new constitution, the right to their languages for religious, educational, cultural, social and economic purposes and especially the right to be tried, administrated and instructed under natural conditions in their own national languages and by their own people as far as they are available." In speaking of exercise of the right to vote, D. Xenopol declared, "Certainly citizens of Hungarian, German, Ruthenian and other origins living in compact groups in certain regions of the country will elect their representatives in the electoral districts normally composed of the administrative districts of those regions, and their voices will be heard in Parliament." Concerning the principles of organization of judicial authority and its expression in unified Romania's constitution, Andrei Radulescu thought the Mohammedan courts should be maintained. He pointed out, "The Moslems in Romania have their courts instituted by virtue of the law on judicial organization... Therefore, as an assurance to this population it is better to specify in the Constitution itself... that courts will be instituted for cases between Moslems relating to family organization, parental authority, marriage, divorce and intestate inheritances." (15)

The constitution ratified on 27 March 1923, which legalized the Romanian state's historic achievements and democratic reforms after 1918, specified the minorities' rights and obligations in the spirit of the postwar peace treaties. (16)

\*Recommended before the new constitution was ratified.

It was provided in Section II ("On Romanians' Rights") Article 5 that "Romanians regardless of ethnic origin, language or religion enjoy freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of association and all the rights and freedoms provided by law." (17) Article 8 of the same section says, "No distinction of birth or social class is permitted in the state. All Romanians regardless of ethnic origin, language or religion are equal before the law and obligated to contribute without distinction to the public tax burdens." Article 133 of Section VII ("Temporary and Supplementary Provisions") expressly referred to naturalization of Jews and the terms on which Jews without Romanian citizenship could obtain it. (18)

Concerning the Romanian state, it should be noted that the Constitution of March 1923 created the legal and modern conditions for its normal development by harmonizing its national, uniform and indivisible character (Article 1 of the Constitution) with recognition of the rights of all citizens regardless of their ethnic origin, language or religion (Articles 5, 7, 8, 22, 28, 29, 119). We find the same principle confirmed and developed in subsequent laws like the Law on Elementary and Normal State Education of 1924 (Articles 7, 161, 201), the Law on Private Education of 1925 (Articles 3, 7, 24, 26, 27, 55, 59, 62, 110, 113), the Law on Sects of 1928 (Articles 11, 12, 13, 15, 30, 31) et al. (19)

Unified Romania's effort to solve the minorities problem democratically was also reflected in the formation of special bodies that studied, recommended and checked the implementation of the state decisions on this subject. For instance, in the Directing Council (an administrative body functioning from 1918 to 1920 to solve regional problems in Transylvania and the Banat), Vasile Goldis was appointed to head the section for "sects and public instruction" as well as "management of relations with the minority nations (nationalities -- our note) and religions."\* In 1931 the post of minister state secretary for minorities was instituted under the Chairmanship of the Council of Ministers under the Nicolae Iorga government. From 18 April 1931 to 19 October 1932 this post was held by Rudolf Brandesch in the cabinets of N. Iorga and Al. Vaida-Voevod, and he was followed by Mihail Serban (from 14 January to 13 November 1933) and Alexandru Lapedatu (9 January to 1 October 1934). (20) Of course this is only one aspect of the problem. Let us also consider how the Romanian state's policy toward the national minorities was actually implemented. As we know, before the end of World War I as well as after it was over a series of laws was enacted to carry out agrarian reform, which was accomplished after 1918 under the unified Romanian national state, when 6,008,098 hectares were expropriated on the basis of the agrarian reform laws, or over 66 percent of the 9,242,930 hectares in the big estates. The expropriated landowners also included 260 great Hungarian and Austrian absentee landowners. (21) At the end of the agrarian reform 206,265 of the total 1,393,353 peasants who were granted land, or 19 percent, were of the minority nationalities (82,640 in Transylvania\*, 94,480 in Bessarabia and 29,145 in Bucovina). (22)

The main characteristic of the agrarian reform in Romania was the formation of a broad mass of small and medium peasant owners and a considerable reduction of the big holdings, especially of the landed gentry.\*\* Note also that it was a radical reform compared with those in other countries in the postwar period.\*

The implementation of the agrarian reform in the period right after the end of World War I, with all its broadly democratic character, was viewed with hostility



by the reactionary circles in Hungary, who instituted proceedings in international forums on grounds of damage to the interests of the Hungarian landowners in Transylvania. Before pursuing the development of "the problem of the optants," as this Romanian-Hungarian dispute was called at the time, let us describe the way the Romanian peasants were impropriated in pursuance of the agrarian laws.

The provisions of the agrarian reform for the Romanian provinces united with the motherland in 1918 differed from those for the Old Kingdom. The Romanian legislator favored the impropriated peasants in those provinces by setting the compensation quota lower than that set for the impropriated peasants in Old Romania. The rates they had to pay in compensation in 40 annual installments were based on the rentals in 1910-1914. And while the agrarian legislation for the Old Kingdom enabled the landowners to keep between 100 and 500 hectares of their land, that for Bessarabia for example left the landowners a uniform maximum of 100 hectares. The more radical nature of the reform for Bessarabia is also apparent from the fact that the law included the forests, which were disregarded by the legislator in Old Romania. (23)

The differences among provinces in the agrarian laws were explained by the economic differences among the provinces. As Nicolae Titulescu, the Romanian delegate to the Council of the League of Nations, said in his statement at the meeting on 20 April 1923, "The fact that Romania could expropriate through several agrarian laws has a historical explanation," and he went on to say, "But the principles that guided the legislators are the same and the differences are only in details to be explained by local economic considerations. Therefore it is pointless to contrast the expropriation law for Transylvania with the one for the Old Kingdom or to try to explain the minor differences between them by the presence of Hungarians in Transylvania and the absence of Hungarians in the Old Kingdom." (24)

The differences in the agrarian laws passed in unified Romania in the first post-war years evidenced the legislators' realism as well as their adequate understanding of the economic interests of both the Romanian population and the national minorities in each province. In their concern to maintain correct relations both between Romanians and minorities and between minorities and the Romanian authorities, the legislators showed themselves equally exacting toward both Romanians and the minority population. In Transylvania, the Banat and Crisana one of the provisions of the expropriation law, as of all the agrarian legislation, covered the terms on which the absentees' lands were confiscated. The standard set by the legislator was clear, namely that the owner became expropriable if he had not been in the country for a certain time when the law was published. Neither the law nor the later provisions showed any concern for the absentee owner's nationality. As it said in an instruction of 14 August 1922, "The law makes no distinction as to the owner's nationality, implying without saying that it does not matter whether he (the owner -- our note) may be a citizen (Romanian -- our note) or a foreigner (of another nationality -- our note)." (25). Furthermore, the legislator defined the category of absentees much more strictly in Old Romania, to the point of regarding owners as absentees who rented their lands and did not live in Romania in the 1910-1920 period.

Although it was clear that the legislator did not pursue an agrarian policy discriminating against minorities or favoring Romanians, the Hungarian counts induced the Horthyite government to stir up a diplomatic incident to be resolved

before international forums. And so on 15 March 1923 the Hungarian government petitioned the Council of the League of Nations, on the basis of Article II of the League Pact, to the effect that the agrarian expropriations in Romania affected the real property of the persons who had opted for Hungarian nationality and accordingly contravened, in the Hungarian government's opinion, Article 63 of the Treaty of Trianon. At first the two governments negotiated through the intermediary of a representative of the Council of the League of Nations, Mine-teiro Adachi, at the Japanese Embassy in Brussels on 23 May 1923. On that occasion the Hungarian government acknowledged that "Romania's right to expropriate the optants' property was compatible with the Treaty of Trianon." (26) Later on the Hungarian government ceased to recognize the compatibility of the agrarian reform and petitioned the mixed Romanian-Hungarian tribunal in Paris that the Romanian expropriation after World War I was actually a "liquidation" of the optants' property contravening the peace treaty. Romania in turn petitioned the League of Nations, on the basis of the same text in the treaty, to settle the dispute. In September 1927 the report compiled by a commission of representatives of England, China and Japan concluded that the agrarian reform in Romania was justified as well as compatible with the provisions of the Treaty of Trianon.

Further exploiting the problem of protecting the minorities in the successor states, Hungary also occupied the Council of the League of Nations with the problem of the optants at the meetings in 1929. The dispute was settled by a transaction made during the Reparations Conference at the Hague in January 1930, when Romania's sovereign right to effect the agrarian reform was recognized. Nevertheless a fund called the "Capital A Fund" amounting to about 2.2 million gold crowns was formed to cover the expenses of the agrarian lawsuits between the two states under the auspices of the League of Nations. Although Romania was in the right it agreed to this solution, wishing to improve its diplomatic relations with Hungary and not to impair the League of Nations' prestige. Consequently the Hague agreements of 20 January 1930 and the Paris ones of 28 April 1930 were ratified by Romania on 4 June 1930, the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Treaty of Trianon. (27)

Romania was to take the same conciliatory attitude toward another Hungarian lawsuit in the League of Nations concerning the agrarian reform. This time the Hungarian government complained in a petition of 18 February 1925 that the expropriation violated the rights of the Hungarian colonists in Transylvania and the Banat and consequently the provisions of the minorities treaty. In order not to aggravate a problem already occupying some League of Nations authorities, to protect its own national minorities, and not to strain its relations with Hungary any further, the Romanian state agreed to an indemnity of 700,000 gold francs for the expropriated colonists. (28)

The enactment of the agrarian reform, as well as its enforcement, favored the economic situation of the peasant masses, the development of agricultural production, and the capitalist character of agriculture. There was a slight but steady trend toward increased production of bread grains due to higher yields per hectare and expansion of areas planted in wheat and corn, as well as a rising trend in the output of industrial crops. The numbers of livestock steadily increased until 1929 and became relatively stable in the 1929-1937 period. At the same time the investments in agriculture were also increased, leading to a greater supply of agricultural equipment. The postwar agrarian enactments in



Romania would have been more effective and beneficial to the development of the Romanian economy if their provisions had been carried out completely and more promptly.

The broadly democratic character of the agrarian reform in Romania attracted the attention of international public opinion, the specialists, and the politicians. As contrasted with Hungarian views, which opposed the agrarian enactments in Romania, many authors as well as foreign publications judged the reform both by its widely democratic content and by its effects upon the social position of the rural population including the national minorities.

For example Marcel Gillard, in a work published in Paris in 1922, described the agrarian reform as "the most important event in the social experience of new Romania. Instead of going back to the uncertainty of an inflamed, embittered mass susceptible to all the impulses of poverty and resentment, the Romanian state has relied in its reconstruction upon a mass of small landowners who are masters of their labor, energy and property." (29) The opinion was expressed in a monograph published in the next year concerning some western circles' fears of the effects of the agrarian reform that "This pessimism is unwarranted. On the contrary, it appears that Romania will attain production figures (and consequently also export figures) in the near future that are hitherto unknown." (30) Jacques Ancel, professor at the Institute of Advanced International Studies in Paris, stressed the radical nature of the agrarian reform in Romania in a book published in 1928, wherein he also expressed some interesting opinions about the "agrarian problem" as one "vital to all the Balkans." In Romania, he wrote, "more than anywhere else the territorial and linguistic unity of a new nation... could be maintained only through a social, rural unity. The big Hungarian landowners in Transylvania... and the domination of the big landowners in Wallachia and Moldavia could not be maintained. Bessarabia, which had just been freed from the Russian yoke, had already outlined its reform, and it had to follow in the Old Kingdom. In 1918-1921 the agrarian law reduced the holdings to 500 hectares on the plains and 200 hectares in the populated hill areas, expropriated the arable estates of the Crown, the foreigners and the absentees and 2 million hectares of latifundia, and set the family plot at 5 hectares or 3 hectares in exceptional cases." (31)

In the opinion of the Czechoslovakian publication PRAGER PRESSE for 10 May 1925, "The agrarian reform (in Romania -- our note) has been successfully accomplished," and in that of the Chilean daily LA NACION for 15 February 1927, it "demonstrated the advantage of small-scale cultivation over the large-scale cultivation" of the landowners. (32) In the view of the well-known American daily the NEW YORK TIMES for 30 November 1940, the Romanian peasants, "peaceable working people," were "beneficiaries of a much more advanced agrarian program than those of their neighbors." (33) In its turn the Viennese Daily SUEDEST-ECHO for 3 December 1940 compared the state of Hungarian agriculture with that of agriculture in Romania and Czechoslovakia with words of praise for the last two, saying "Agrarian reforms have done away with the supremacy of great landed property in Czechoslovakia and Romania, and the national economies of those countries have been oriented toward the small peasant holdings." (34)

The agrarian reform was an economic measure that equally concerned the national minorities in Romania, so that it was natural for their representatives or their

contemporary publications to take an interest in it and state their positions. ELORE, the Hungarian-language organ of the PCR /Romanian Communist Party/, criticized the stand of the big Hungarian landowners, who "are demanding another law and 10 times the price" in compensation for the expropriated land. The nature and effects of the agrarian reform were clearly analyzed by the militant communist Jozsa Bela, who concluded in the daily SZABAD SZO for 26 May 1943 that "The opponents of the agrarian reform keep citing its failure in Transylvania as an example. They say the gross output went down because the peasants could not work the divided land as they should, but they omit the fact that the main reason for the agrarian reform was the social uncertainty in 1919-1920 and that certain Romanian national interests had to be allowed for in applying it, so that the working conditions and the results obtained were unequal in the various regions of the country. In general it could be said that in spite of the many defects in the reform the peasants' living standard was improved, even in the period of the great agrarian crisis. And so the harm is not to be sought in the agrarian reform or in the division of the land, but in the way it was applied, the lack of agricultural equipment, and the policy that followed the reform." (36)

The minorities were given equal opportunities for participating in all sectors of the Romanian economy, in finance, cooperatives and trade. Although the Romanian state inherited a peculiar situation in the Romanian territories under foreign rule before 1918, in that the vexatious measures taken against Romanians during that rule caused a massive advancement of the interests of the Hungarian, Austrian and Russian bourgeoisie as indicated by the dominant positions of the respective bourgeois, it brought no pressure to bear and took no restrictive measures, granting them full freedom of expression. Note also that the Romanian officials in the period between the wars and especially under the liberal cabinets drafted special protectionist legislation limiting the penetration of foreign capital into Romania, but without affecting the situation of the minority bourgeoisie's capital in any way.

A few figures on this subject are illustrative of unified Romania's stand in such an important area as the minorities' participation in the economy. In the middle of the 1930's the structure of industrial ownership in Romania indicated an absolute majority of minority capital. Out of the total joint stock companies and private firms taken together, 2,383 belonged to Romanian citizens of Hungarian, German, Jewish and other nationalities and only 626 were owned by Romanians. The percentages were as follows: The joint stock companies were 18.9 percent Romanian, 35.7 percent the minorities, and 23.1 percent foreign capital, while the private firms were 6.2 percent Romanian, 8.8 percent Jewish, 1.8 percent Hungarian, 3.1 percent German and 2.4 percent other nationalities. (37) In other words, in 1935 industrial property in Romania was owned over 80 percent by the minorities and foreign capital and less than 20 percent by Romanians. (38)

In the textile industry, in second place among the Romanian industrial sectors, the administrative councils were controlled by representatives of the minorities bourgeoisie. In 1935, for example, 61.7 percent of those councils were controlled by representatives of the minorities bourgeoisie and 38.3 percent by Romanians, while 11.1 percent of the higher administrative personnel were Romanians and 88.9 percent were of the minorities, and most (89.5 percent) of the higher technical personnel belonged to the minorities. (39)

Minorities capital participated in various companies and predominated on the eve of World War II in the metallurgical, electrotechnical, wood, chemical, leather goods, textile, glass and ceramics, food, paper and graphic arts industries, and a similar situation obtained in finance. Out of 555 banks and 178 major branches, 183 were Jewish, 123 German, 78 Hungarian and 25 other nationalities, totaling 409. (41)

Out of a total 1,370 industrial enterprises with an invested capital of 5.3 billion lei, 971 with a capital of 3.7 million lei belonged to Jewish finance. (42) The local and regional situations, especially in Transylvania, the Banat and Bessarabia, were even more favorable to the minorities. According to some 1925 figures, in 21 urban localities in Transylvania there were 1,272 Romanian industrialists (12.72 percent) and a total of 8,714 Hungarian, German, Jewish and other industrialists (87.28 percent). (43)

The same was true of trade. Out of 280,000 registered commercial firms 173,000 belonged to Jews and the rest to Hungarians, Germans et al. (44)

Romania's economic development in the period following the unification in 1918 involved areas of a pronounced agricultural character inhabited by a population of Hungarian, German and other origins in the industrialization process to a greater extent. Under these circumstances it was natural for the number of civil servants and workers among the national minorities to increase, and consequently their urban population increased as well. Partial figures, for Transylvania alone, show a considerable growth of the German and Jewish populations in the urban centers. Whereas in 1910 the urban population of the two nationalities amounted to 180,438 citizens, it reached 201,048 inhabitants in 1920. (45)

The guarantee of the minorities' unrestricted participation in the economy, graphically illustrated by figures that speak for themselves, was objectively correlated with promotion of the same working conditions and pay rates for the minorities population\*. While in Austria-Hungary before 1918 workers were not paid according to the kind, quality and quantity of work performed, a uniform wage system was introduced in Romania for all workers regardless of nationality, and labor protection was provided in the Constitution of 1923 (Article 21), which stipulated that "All elements in production enjoy equal protection... Freedom to work will be protected."

The Romanian state showed the same solicitude for civil servants, although the situation was different and to some extent delicate. What happened? Toward the end of 1921 Hungary intensified its propaganda against Romania, especially in the foreign press, maintaining that the Romanian government had expelled tens of thousands of Hungarian civil servants from Transylvania, which claim has been renewed by some Hungarian historians six decades later. It is true that many Hungarian civil servants emigrated from Transylvania to Hungary after World War I, but the reason for their departure was not expulsion but another one very well known to the Hungarian historians who made and are making the accusation in the effort to prove to public opinion that the Hungarians remaining in Romania were treated harshly.

What is the truth? After 1 December 1918 Hungary initiated efforts to compromise Romania abroad and tried to convince the Paris Peace Conference that

Romania was incapable of administering the liberated lands, with the obsession of returning those lands to Hungary. Sabotaging the Romanian administration in Transylvania was one of the steps taken. Emissaries of the Horthyite regime traveled far and wide in Transylvania trying to induce the Hungarian civil servants not to take the oath of loyalty to the Romanian state. They threatened that when Transylvania was "reoccupied" those who disobeyed that order were to be discharged. The railroad employees were urged to disrupt railway traffic, cause collisions, and derail trains. They also tried to induce the Hungarians in Transylvania who refused to take the oath to emigrate to Hungary, where they were promised jobs. To provide for the existence of the civil servants remaining outside the service, the Hungarian government sent them clandestine material aid. On 24 December 1919, 1.3 million lei were found hidden in the coal on the Simplon locomotive running from Budapest to Bucharest.

Believing the Hungarian emissaries, thousands of civil servants in Transylvania left their jobs and emigrated to Hungary. Since jobs could not be provided for them all, many of them became destitute, especially those settled in Budapest.

The fact that the Hungarian civil servants departed of their own free will is indicated by the large number of railroad employees who, as contrasted with other civil servants, did not heed the orders or advice of the Hungarian emissaries and took the oath of loyalty to the Romanian state. For example in 1933, 45 percent of the total employees of the Transylvanian railways were Hungarians.

In addition to meeting its obligations to respect the minorities' basic rights in the spirit of international law, Romania performed a humanitarian act that was not specified by any treaty. The Hungarian civil servants who refused to take the oath of loyalty and remained in Transylvania lost their jobs in the state institutions, which was natural and would have happened in any state, but they maintained their existence out of accumulated reserves or the incomes from their real property or they transferred to private economic enterprises. Ten years later when some of the former Hungarian civil servants reached retirement age and consequently had lost their capacity to work for a living, Romania granted them the right to a pension for the years served under Austro-Hungarian rule. Despite the fact that they were customarily considered hostile to Romania, in drafting the law their refusal to take the oath was attributed to their chauvinistic indoctrination and the policy pursued by prewar Hungary. This situation was regulated according to the provisions of Article 22 of Regulation No 43 of the Law of 20 August 1929 amending some of the provisions of the General Pension Law of 15 April 1925.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. There are and have been national minorities in all these countries (See "Les problemes de l'Europe centrale," Felix Alcan Book House, Paris 1923 p 86).
2. In Poland for example according to the census of September 1921 out of a total 27,177,000 inhabitants 18,632,000 (69.2 percent) were Poles and 8,532,000 (30.8 percent) national minorities (Milica Moldoveanu, "Poland in 1926," ANALE DE ISTORIE XXV, No 4, 1979, p 124). Out of the 14.73 million



inhabitants of the Czechoslovakian state in 1930, 9,757,000 (66.3 percent) were Czechs and Slovaks and the remaining 4,973,000 (33.7 percent) were minorities: 3,318,000 Germans (22.5 percent), 720,000 Hungarians (4.9 percent) 569,000 Ruthenians (3.9 percent), 100,000 Poles (0.7 percent) etc. (Archive of the Ministry of Interior and also Ibid. Documentary Reserve, File 546, Sheet 384). In 1930 the population of Hungary was 8,688,000 including 92.1 percent Hungarians and the rest was a population of other origins: 479,000 Germans (5.5 percent), 105,000 Slovaks (1.2 percent), 28,000 Croats (0.3 percent), 7,000 Serbians (0.1 percent), 5,000 Slovenes (0.1 percent), 5,000 Poles (0.1 percent), 1,000 Italians (0.02 percent) and 37,000 others (0.8 percent) (Loc. cit. Sheet 383). In 1930 Yugoslavia had 13,931,000 inhabitants: 11,108,000 Serbians, Croats and Slovenes (79.8 percent) and the rest were other nationalities, including 496,000 Germans (3.6 percent), 466,000 Hungarians (3.3 percent), 9,000 Italians (0.1 percent) etc. (Loc. cit. Sheet 386).

\* The minorities had the following structure: 1,426,000 Hungarians (7.9 percent), 745,900 Germans (Saxons and Swabians) (4.1 percent), 725,000 Jews (4 percent), 582,000 Ruthenians and Ukrainians (3.2 percent), 407,800 Russians (2.3 percent), 365,700 Bulgarians (2 percent), 262,000 Gypsies (1.5 percent), 154,000 Turks (0.9 percent), 105,000 Gagauti (0.6 percent), 51,500 Czechs and Slovaks (0.3 percent), 50,800 Serbians, Croats and Slovenes (0.3 percent), 48,100 Poles (0.3 percent), 25,000 Greeks (0.1 percent) 22,000 Tatars (0.1 percent), 13,400 Armenians (below 0.1 percent), 12,400 Guzuls (below 0.1 percent), 4,600 Albanians (below 0.1 percent), and 61,300 others (0.3 percent) (Dr S. Manuila, D. C. Georgescu, "Population of Romania," National Printing House, Bucharest 1937, pp 50-51. Lt Col C. Verdes, "Romania's War Potential," REVISTA FUNDATIILOR REGALE, VI, No 4, 1 April 1939, pp 110-111).

3. Arh MI [Archive of the Ministry of Interior], Documentary Reserve, File 546 Vol 51, Sheet 383.
4. Loc. cit., Sheets 384, 386. LE MONDE SLAVE, IV, No 11-12, Nov-Dec 1927.
5. Gheorghe Zaharia, "Romania's Development in 1919-1944," ANALE DE ISTORIE, XXVI, No 3, 1980, pp 41-46.
6. Const. Kiritescu, "History of the War to Unite Romania. 1916-1919," 2d ed, Vol III, House of Schools Publishing House (no address), pp 385-502.
7. "Emergence of the Independent and Unified National States in Central and Southeast Europe (1821-1923)," Vol I, Romanian Academy Publishing House, Bucharest, 1979, p 197.
8. Gheorghe Iancu, Vladimir Zaharescu, "From the Chronicle of Romanian-Hungarian Relations in 1918-1920," ANALE DE ISTORIE, XXVII, No 4, 1981, pp 116-117.
9. Const. Kiritescu, op. cit., Vol III, pp 494-495.
10. Bucharest State Archives, Reserve of the Chairmanship of the Council of Ministers, File 426, Sheets 212-213.



11. Gheorghe Zaharia, *op. cit.*, p 43.
  12. Janos Fazekas, "The RCP. A Consistent Fighter for Brotherhood, Friendship, and Social and National Equality of the Nation's Sons," Political Publishing House, Bucharest 1980, p 339.
  13. Sextil Puscariu, "Memoirs," Minerva Publishing House, Bucharest 1978, p 500.
  14. Gala Galaction, "Selected Works," Vol II, ESPLA [expansion unknown], Bucharest, 1959, p 453.
  15. "Romania's New Constitution and the New European Constitutions," Cultura Nationala Press, Bucharest (1923), pp 159, 211-212, 371, 383.
  16. G. Rommenhoeller, Dutch consul in Bucharest, in a good monograph on Romania, concluded, "The Romanian constitution is a democratic one." ("La Grande Roumanie," The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1926, p 49.
  17. C. Hamangiu, "General Code of Romania. New Laws on Unification, 1922-1926," Vols XI-XII, Universul Publishing House, Bucharest, p 4 ff.
  18. The Article establishes the decree-laws of 29 and 30 Dec 1918 on granting civil rights and the decree-laws of 22 May and 12 Aug 1919 on naturalization of Jews who lived in the Old Kingdom (See "Decree-Laws Including Those Published in MONITORUL OFICIAL 1 Nov-10 Feb 1919," annotated by Vasile Toncescu, Bucharest 1919, pp 44-46, 75-76. "Collected Laws and Regulations Compiled by V. Toncescu and Em. Ottulescu, 1919-1919. Decree-Laws," Bucharest, 1920, p 110.
  19. Gheorghe Sofronie, "Protection of Racial, Linguistic and Religious Minorities Under the Regime of the League of Nations," Casa Nationala a Judetului Bihor Publishing House, Arad 1930, p 96.
- \* Reflecting its respect for minorities, the Directing Council invited their representatives to be consulted on economic, social-political, cultural and religious problems. One example of this among many others was the consultation of the Hungarian and German populations in Transylvania on the draft agrarian reform, to which their representatives agreed, feeling that their interests were protected in the draft.
20. E. Tudorica, I. Burlacu, "Romanian Governments in 1866-1945. Lists of Ministers," REVISTA ARHIVEI, XLVII, Vol XXXII, No 2, 1970, pp 449-450, 452-453.
  21. L. Banyai, "On the Path of Fraternal Traditions," Bucharest, 1971, p 139.
- \* On this point, Nemes Dezso concluded that 317,833 Romanian peasants, 46,069 Hungarian peasants and 24,815 German peasants were granted land in Transylvania ("Az ellenforradalom totenete Magyarorszagon," Academy Publishing House, Budapest, 1962, p 319). Of the 82,640 peasants granted land in Transylvania 45,628 were Hungarians. In Hungary in 1910 agrarian ownership had the following structure: 1,891,933 Hungarian and other owners, or 40 percent of the total Transylvanian population, owned 11,283,816 hectares, or 70 percent of the whole arable area. At the same date the 3,232,802

Romanians, or 60 percent of the province's population, owned 5,598,668 hectares, or 30 percent of the arable area. The average area per owner was 6 hectares for Hungarians and 1 hectare for Romanians.

22. TIMPUL, IV, No 1223 for 26 Sep 1940.

- \*\* For the historical provinces the distribution of large, medium and small holdings was as follows: Holdings less than 100 hectares (before the Unification): 4,593,148 hectares in the Old Kingdom (57.5 percent of the entire area), 2,337,811 hectares in Bessarabia (55.9 percent), 4,689,855 hectares in Transylvania (63.0 percent), and 405,000 hectares in Bucovina (78 percent). Holdings over 100 hectares (before 1918): 3,397,851 hectares in the Old Kingdom (42.4 percent), 1,844,539 hectares in Bessarabia (55.9 percent), 2,751,457 hectares in Transylvania (37 percent), and 115,000 hectares in Bucovina (22 percent). Accordingly before the Unification 59.77 percent of the arable area was in small holdings and 40.23 percent in large holdings. After 1918 the situation was as follows: Holdings less than 100 hectares: 7,369,549 hectares in the Old Kingdom (92.22 percent), 3,829,731 hectares in Bessarabia (91.57 percent), 6,353,664 hectares in Transylvania (85.38 percent), and 480,967 hectares in Bucovina (92.49 percent). Holdings over 100 hectares: 621,450 hectares in the Old Kingdom (7.78 percent), 352,618 hectares in Bessarabia (8.43 percent), 1,087,648 hectares in Transylvania (14.62 percent) and 39,033 hectares in Bucovina (7.51 percent). Under the new conditions 89.56 percent of the arable area was in holdings less than 100 hectares and 11.44 percent in holdings over 100 hectares (Encyclopedia of Romania, Vol I, p 584). The above figures clearly indicate the changed ratio between large holdings and small and medium holdings in favor of the latter, reflecting the broad democratic character of the agrarian laws enacted in Romania in 1917-1921. The latter increased the average plot by 6-8 hectares in Bessarabia, by 4 hectares in Bucovina, by 5 hectares in Transylvania and by 5 hectares in the Old Kingdom (George Ci-paiamu, "Effect of the Agrarian Reform on Agricultural Production in United Romania," ARHIVA PENTRU STIINTA SI REFORMA SOCIALA, II, No 4, Jan 1921, p 512).
- \* In Poland over 38 percent of the arable area of the country (14,186,605 hectares) was in large holdings. Thanks to the agrarian reform, the following areas had been expropriated annually by 1923: 13,000 hectares in 1919, 28,000 hectares in 1920, 67,000 hectares in 1921, 52,000 hectares in 1922 and 100,000 hectares in 1923, so that a total of 260,000 hectares was expropriated in that period (DEMOCRATIA, XII, No 7-8, Jul-Aug 1924, p 8). In Czechoslovakia according to some figures 128,559 requests for land were met by 1922 through the agrarian legislation of 1918-1920, and 101,119 hectares were allotted for the purpose (DEMOCRATIA, XIII, No 11-12, Nov-Dec 1925, p 12). The Hungarian historian Hajdu Tibor said about the agrarian reforms in Poland and Czechoslovakia that "In Poland the distribution of land was far less radical than in the other Baltic countries, but one-fifth of the area of the big estates was sacrificed to satisfy the hunger for land, although it was distributed at a slower rate and with many evasions. In Czechoslovakia, where fewer estates could be distributed, about half of the estates larger than 100 hectares were divided up." ("Az 1918-as magyarországi polgári demokratikus forradalom," Kossuth Publishing House, Budapest 1968, p 381). In Lithuania the "reform in 1920 was quite moderate

but later it was extended to holdings of 150 hectares" (Hajdu Tibor, op. cit., p 381). In Hungary the agrarian reform did not meet with the approval of the majority of the ruling classes" and was consequently limited (Hajdu Tibor op. cit., p 381). The American journalist David Mitrany said about this particular situation in Hungary compared with the other countries in Central and Eastern Europe that "In most of the eastern countries it can be said that the leading agrarian class hastened to give up their land in order to retain power, and the exception of Hungary only corroborates the rule. Hungary may have had more land in the hands of the big landowner than any other European country." ("Marx Against the Peasant. A Study in Social Dogmatism," Collier Books, New York, 1961, p 80)

23. Marcel Gillard, "La Roumanie Nouvelle," Felix Alcan Publishing House, Paris 1922, pp 19-20.

24. "La Reforme agraire en Roumanie et les optants Hongrois de Transilvanie devant la Societe des Nations. Mars - Juillet 1923," Jouve L. Cie Editeurs, Paris, 1924, p 38.

25. Ibid.

26. "Encyclopedia of Romania," Vol I, p 986.

\* The Hungarian government's explanation was purely formal, on the ground that the refusal to sign a Romanian-Hungarian agreement in Brussels was because the Hungarian delegation had no such mandate, whereas actually Count Emeric Csaki, former foreign minister, and Ladislau Gajzago, counselor in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, were delegated by the director of the Ministry of Justice.

27. "Encyclopedia of Romania," Vol I, p 986.

28. Ibidem, p 987. The problem of the optants as well as that of the colonists of Hungarian origin in Transylvania and the Banat was carefully followed by all Romanian public opinion including the labor movement. Among the many stands taken against the action brought by Hungary in the League of Nations, an editorial article in SOCIALISMUL, the main publication of the PSD /Social-Democratic Party/, for 18 Sep 1927 concluded that "The expropriation specially effected for natives and residents in the country was complete for absentees, that is for those living abroad. But most of those expropriated in this category are the Hungarian counts who had immense and rich territories in Transylvania and stayed in Budapest as leaders of the Hungarian state, and the Romanian agrarian law was applied to them as to all the landowners, and within the limits of good will. The Hungarian magnates were and are dissatisfied with the price set by law and the money paid. What was given the landowners of all nationalities who live in Romania did not satisfy the landowners who remained Hungarian citizens, who refused to recognize the expropriation and set price, and who appealed to the international courts against the Romanian laws. Although this question has been before the international courts for several years, not until today did it come to the attention of public opinion or come near a solution. Counts Bethlen, Teleky and Banfy, who dominate Hungary and had immense estates in

Transylvania, are now fighting for their feudal claims because the international climate is more favorable to their claims today. A reactionary, clerical and monarchist regime prevails in nearly all of Europe today. The Hungarian nobles, by virtue of their ties of kinship and their services to the international reaction, are in the good graces of all the conservative governments today. The England of Baldwin and Rothermere, the Italy of Mussolini, the France of Poincare and the Germany of Hindenburg have every sympathy for the hordes of Horthy. The entire international, governmental and reactionary press is pleading the Hungarian optants' cause today both out of sympathy for the reactionary Hungarian nobility and especially out of antipathy to the revolutionary idea of expropriation.. The Romanian state cannot accede today to the Hungarian magnates' claims. It is a moral and material impossibility. From the moral standpoint, the Romanian state cannot accede because it cannot allow its expropriation to apply solely to the Romanian, Russian, German and Jewish landowners, who are Romanian citizens, while the noble citizens of Hungary go on enjoying, in Romania, all the benefits of the old feudal system. The Romanian state cannot allow it to be determined from outside to whom it shall apply and to whom it shall not apply its laws. From the material standpoint, it is actually impossible to satisfy the Hungarian nobles' demands. To do so would mean taking back the expropriated lands from the hands of the peasants in Transylvania and the Banat, which not even a new czarist government in Russia could venture to do. And it would be equally impossible for the Romanian state to pay the Hungarian magnates a compensation in gold which would be equivalent to about 3 times Romania's annual budget."

29. Marcel Gillard, op. cit., pp 11-12.
30. "Les problemes de l'Europe centrale," Felix Alcan Publishing House, Paris 1923, p 130.
31. Jacques Ancel, "Les Balkans face a l'Italie," Paris, Delagrave Publishing House, 1928, p 71.
32. Bucharest State Archives, Ministry of Propaganda Reserve, File 10 1926-1927 Sheets 28-34.
33. Loc. cit., File 1162 1940-1941, Sheet 52.
34. Loc. cit., Sheet 53. More recent works also appreciate the favorable aspects of the agrarian reform in Romania. For example the American journalist David Mitrany thinks the reform can actually be called "an agrarian revolution with three aspects, social, economic and political." In his opinion the reform "completely did away with the big landowner class." (David Mitrany, op. cit., p 83) In another work Elizabeth Wiskermann concluded that after 1918 Romania made an "important redistribution of lands that endowed many of the small peasants with land that became their property." ("Europe of the Dictators. 1919-1945," Harper Torch Books, New York, 1966) Hilda Buncakova commented, "Although the agrarian reform in Romania also had its disadvantages, it was a measure that promoted national economic development because it considerably weakened big landed property, which it did not entirely eliminate, and because it made it possible to extend



capitalist production relations to the villages." The same author, in speaking of the way the reform was carried out, maintains that land was allotted to the peasants in all the historical Rumanian provinces: "The agrarian laws for the Old Kingdom, Transylvania and Bucovina were published in July 1921, the law for Bessarabia having been passed in March 1920, and they began to expand expropriation (Over 6 million hectares in all were to be expropriated) and to divide up the land into the peasants' private properties, in the form of plots of 4-10 hectares" (Hilda Buncakova, "The Communist Party in Romania and the Agrarian Problem in 1918-1921," SLOVANSKE STUDIE, XIX, No 4, 1978, pp 153-175).

Some more recent opinions tend to diminish the good effects of the agrarian reform, to the point of denying them, or even to evade it, wrongly maintaining that "Romania practiced colonial exploitation" in the historical Romanian provinces united with Romania in 1918 and that the Romanian authorities "plundered the working peasantry in Bessarabia" on a wide scale in pursuance of the "agrarian reform." The differences between the texts of the impropriation law for Bessarabia and of that for the Old Kingdom are attributed to the Romanian governments' intention "to expropriate the peasants but not the big landowners." The same sources assert that "In the course of the 'reform' the peasants were dispossessed of 787,618 hectares, or 42.9 percent of the total area they owned at the end of 1917" (V. Lungu, "The Policy of Terror and Plunder in Bessarabia. 1918-1920," The Moldavian Book, Chisinau, 1980. S. Afteniuc, "Replacement of Oppressed Labor by Free Labor," COMUNISTUL MOLDOVEI, No 5, 1981).

35. See FLORE (Tirgu Mures), II, No 9, 26 Feb 1926.
36. T. Micu, A. Simion, "Jozsa Bela (1893-1943), Bucharest 1971, p 133.
37. "Encyclopedia of Romania," Vol III, p 824.
38. Ibid.
39. Ibid., p 823.
40. Arh MI, Documentary Reserve, File 245, Vol I, Sheets 55-64. Compared with the situation under Hungarian rule, in unified Romania 10 years after the unification the German bourgeoisie alone in Transylvania had 450 economic and cooperative associations, which meant an increase of 33 such associations (P. Garboviceanu, "The Minorities in Romania: Hungarians and Szeklers, Saxons and Swabians," House of Schools Publishing House, Bucharest 1928, pp 52-53). In Bessarabia in 1923 the structure of the industrial enterprises by nationalities was as follows: In urban areas: 36 Romanian and 279 minorities (24 Russian, 202 Jewish, 4 Polish etc.). In rural areas: 967 Romanian and 1,232 minorities (207 Russian, 430 Bulgarian, 291 Jewish, 96 German etc.) (Stefan Ciobanu, "Bessarabia. A Monograph," State Printing House, Chisinau 1926, pp 425-426). For further data on the positions of the Jewish bourgeoisie in the economy and finance, see Dr Arthur Ruppin, "Die soziologie der Juden," Vol I, Juedische Verlag, Berlin (1930), pp 442-443, 448-480.



41. Arh MI, Documentary Reserve, File 299, Vol I, Sheets 355-356.
42. Paul A. Shapiro, "Prelude to Dictatorship in Romania: The National Christian Party in Power. December 1937 - February 1938," CANADIAN-AMERICAN SLAVIC STUDIES, VIII, No 1, 1974, p 73.
43. Petru Suci, "Development of the Transylvanian Cities," SOCIETATEA DE MIINE, IV, No 10-11, 13, 20 Mar 1927, p 136. In Transylvania at the end of 1929 the credit cooperatives had the following structure by nationalities: 415 Romanian, 187 German, and 270 Hungarian (SOCIETATEA DE MIINE, XI, No 12, Dec 1934, p 209).
44. Paul S. Shapiro, op. cit., p 73.
45. Petre Suci, "Problem of the Transylvanian Cities," SOCIETATEA DE MIINE, I, No 26, 18 Oct 1924, p 517.
- \* It is well known that Romania was a member of the International Labor Organization from its founding, ratifying the agreements it adopted and actively participating in its meetings. Following a social policy inspired by its resolutions, Romania instituted a ministry of labor in Mar 1920 as an institution specializing in labor problems (For some aspects of this problem, see G. Vladescu-Racoasa, "Romania and the International Labor Organization," SOCIETATEA DE MIINE, XI, No 4-5, Apr-May 1934, p 76).

5186

CSO: 2700/79

BRIEFS

SENTENCED FOR HOSTILE ACTS--A 17-year old student in Decani was sentenced to 60 days in prison for damaging a picture of Comrade Tito at the secondary school on 16 December. Avdush Ukshin (21 years Old) from the village of Kamena Glava near Urosevac was sentenced to 18 months in prison for being a member of an enemy group in this village and for providing a typewriter on which this group had written enemy propaganda material. [Excerpt] [Pristina RILINDJA in Albanian 21 Dec 82 p 6] -- The magistrates court in Istok sentenced Skender Arifajt (20) to 60 days in prison, Arif Arifajt (49) and Salih Arifajt (60) to 40 days in prison for damaging the fields of two Serbian farms in the area. [Excerpt] [Pristina RILINDJA in Albanian 24 Dec 82 p 6]

CSO: 2100/21

END

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

feb 23, 1983